NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCLXII.

JANUARY, 1887.

THE RENAISSANCE OF NATIONALISM.

One of the most notable features of our recent literature has been the revival of interest in matters connected with the war of rebellion. That such a revival must some time have occurred was a thing inevitable in the nature of events. Immediately upon the conclusion of any great conflict, but more especially of a civil war, there always comes a period when public interest in the causes and incidents of the strife may be said to lag. The soldier is glad to be at home and rest from "war's alarms," and the non-combatant has heard more than enough about the struggle in which he had no part. So when the returning heroes have been fairly welcomed home, their trophies counted, their personal adventures related and their presence become again familiar, the people turn away from the agony of strife and seek relief in lighter themes. The conquerors pall of triumph and the conquered shun whatever reminds them of defeat.

Two forces especially tended to produce this result among the people of the North, who constitute the chief part of our reading public. An almost incredible proportion of its population were opposed to the prosecution of the war—the attempt to coerce the rebellious States. As the period of conflict recedes it seems more and more wonderful that the National cause prevailed. Year by year the fact grows clearer to the observer's eye that the burthen

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of war at the front was hardly greater than that of disaffection in the rear. The next generation will find it hard to believe that of the four men living at the outbreak of the war who had occupied the presidential chair not one tendered his support to the National cause, or offered sympathy or patriotic counsel to his overburdened successor at the head of the Government. It will be deemed almost incredible that during the whole four years of that terrible struggle not one of these men, all of whom were citizens of Northern States, made any public utterance intended to strengthen the Union cause or indeed any utterance at all upon the subject, except in one case, when compelled by public clamor to make a lame excuse for his own apathy. Already it is hard to realize that when the conflict drew to its close one of these men refused to decorate his house in honor of our final tri-victory, or display the emblems of mourning on the death of the great leader whose marvelous tact and unfailing steadfastnesss had brought us through those years of unmatched peril. Still more difficult will it be for posterity to understand that our ex-Presidents were simply types of a very large element of our people. These very naturally desired the war, its causes and overshadowing glories to be forgotten just as soon as possible. They made haste, therefore, to turn the public attention into other channels and to clamor for oblivion in regard to the past.

There was another and most peculiar influence tending in this direction. The political organization then having control of the country had in it two elements which looked with especial disfavor on the ascendency within itself of those whose fame rested on military renown. One of these was what was known as the "Abolition Element." These men regarded themselves as, in a sense, the possessors of an exclusive proprietary interest in the Republican party of that day, and thought that the laurels of its first administration, both civic and military, ought to relate back to them as the ultimate cause, rather than rest upon the heads of the immediate agents. Such men as Chase, Sumner, Seward, Greeley, and a host of lesser lights, felt deeply aggrieved at being overshadowed by men like Lincoln, Grant, Sherman, and Stanton, and other military leaders whom they regarded, if not as trespassers on their demesne, at least as men who had merely adopted their ideas and reaped advantage from their labors. It hurt them all the more to know that these recipients of popular acclaim were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not inclined, during the combat, to submit to their dictation, nor after its close to attribute to them, as they thought, due credit for the result. They could not understand that there had been a change of base in the great onward march, and that only those who were leaders in the new movement could wear its freshest laurels. These men and their followers, who were many and zealous, joined with the former element to deprecate preferment based on military renown, until it became almost a disadvantage to one having political aspirations at the North to have carried a musket or drawn a sword in defense of the country.

To these influences was added also that of certain party leaders who had gained position and prominence during the war, very largely on account of the absence in the military service of those who would otherwise have been their rivals. To perpetuate their power, these men organized their followers and dependents and instructed them to clamor lustily for oblivion for all things connected with the period of war except its political phases. They declared that the struggle was over and all that pertained to it should be forgotten; that soldiers should be remembered with pensions and "homes" *ad libitum*, but for the public service, statesmen trained in the schools, gentlemen polished by social experience and millionaires imbued with the knowledge how to make the many subserve the interest of the few, able to subsidize the press, corrupt delegates and purchase votes and influence—that these men were needed both by party and country to steer the ship of state through the breakers that threatened when war was ended. They inculcated the sentiment that patriotism was well enough in war, but trickery was the keynote of political success in peace.

We should not fail to note also as a force which exerted a powerful influence in producing the result we have indicated, that morbid sentimentality which insisted upon ignoring the righteousness of the National cause and the noble simplicity of motive which inspired its supporters, because of a silly fear that the feelings of those who fought on the other side might be injured by the assertion of these facts.

That such a state of public sentiment must some time come to an end, the dullest might easily predict. The fact cannot always be neglected that the Nation was right, and the South and its sympathizers wrong. So, too, the impression cannot always prevail that the men who were victorious were so greatly inferior

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in patriotism, genius and fortitude to those whom they overcame. It was certain to be demonstrated that the military disadvantages which beset the Union cause were fully equal to those which confronted the Confederates, and that the disaffection of the Northern people went a long way towards equalizing the respective powers.

Besides this our Northern public has only recently had the opportunity of scanning the rebellion from the inside. The truth is that public sentiment had grown so strong in favor of the superiority of Southern statesmanship and Southern strategy, that it became almost imperative to explain why they did not succeed. This made it incumbent on every man of high rank in the army or government of the Confederacy to excuse himself and show that, wherever the fault might rest, he, at least, was not responsible for the failure of the attempt at dismemberment. The chief executive himself set the example. His elaborate apology for the ill-success of the Confederate cause awakened little attention, as the Northern press, like the Northern people, had not sufficient interest in the subject to question its accuracy or rebut its conclusions. Not so, however, the subordinates on whom he weakly and ungenerously sought to cast the stigma of failure. Each one of these made haste to repel the insinuation of default.

With the revival of interest in the events of the war and the conduct and capacity of the leaders of the opposing armies has come also an inclination to revise and readjust our estimates of the political leaders and forces of that time. This, too, was inevitable in the very nature of things. To these contemporaries, the better part of whose activities pertained to a period ante-dating the civil war, such a thing as a just estimate of its leaders, either civil or military, was evidently impossible. The events which occur while men are rising to the zenith of their power, and which constitute the chief elements of whatever fame they may achieve, very naturally color the estimates they make of those who were opponents or co-workers.

Histories, sketches, and memoirs have not been rare since the guns of Moultrie thundered against Fort Sumter. Few men of any note during the period immediately following have escaped the stylus of the literary assassin, while very many have insisted on giving their fame the *coup de grâce* of autobiographic defense.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The character of these works has changed from time to time with the change in public sentiment already indicated. The earlier ones were yet marked with the heat of conflict and its antecedent struggles. Greeley's "American Conflict" showed, with the ghastly clearness of a side-lighted photograph, the view of one whose whole soul had been absorbed by the "Anti-Slavery" idea. Alexander H. Stephens's "War between the States" is its companion piece of antipodal irrelevance. Each was written in justification of views which subsequent events made comparatively unimportant. Sherman's "Memoirs" were red with the glow of battle and full of the reckless abandon that characterized the yet recent march through Georgia. Gen. Joe Johnston, besides writing in self-defense, was yet suffering from the sense of galling injustice on the part of the Confederate executive, and is constitutionally inclined to stand in the shadow of his own greatness. Gen. Badeau's fertile pen was justly prolix in defense of his great chief, but the field was too near for him to maintain a due perspective. Dodge's "Bird's-Eye View" declared the causes of conflict to be immaterial. Vice-President Wilson gave a ponderous history of the "Anti-Slavery Conflict," constructed upon the theory that the rebellion was only an insignificant sequel—the physical result of the antecedent struggle.

It is only within a very recent time—hardly more than a few months indeed—that the attention of the American people has been turned in serious earnest in this direction. The younger portion have awakened to a positive and active interest in the events in which their fathers participated or witnessed, animated by that pride which always exalts the exploits of an ancestor, while the survivors of those who fought have passed the period of satiety and are fast approaching the reminiscent stage which occupies itself in "reviewing the rear."

The prime cause of such a re-awakening at this time is not far to seek. The financial misfortunes of General Grant turned the national attention upon himself, and the physical sufferings which followed hard upon them, as if a persistent evil fate pursued the simple-minded soldier to his tomb, intensified our sympathy. When the hand that had so firmly held the sword, took up the pen with the same grim determination to re-conquer a competence for his family with which it had undertaken the suppression of the rebellion, our attention was divided between

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the suffering hero and the events which made his name memorable. The result has been that the people have greedily consumed everything accessible on this subject. And what a wealth of rich material has been supplied. The President of the republic whose brief but glorious life began and ended with his official tenure, has put in his reserpt of defense against his enemies and of accusation against his subordinates. Grant has given us his artless commentary, written in the agony of dissolution, but obedient to the injunction of his great superior, "with malice towards none and with charity for all." Mr. Blaine has compiled his curiously skillful "Twenty Years." General Logan has told of the war and its causes. The celebrated series of war articles in the *Century* is approaching the end of its second year with undiminished interest. And these are only a small portion of the literature the last two years has given us on the subject.

This inquiry is as yet chiefly confined to particular men and specific events, but these are too closely connected with the great underlying question of right and wrong that affected the two opposing ideas to permit that to be long neglected. Inspired by an unparalleled benignity, the American people have hitherto consented to keep in the background the chief question involved in a determination of the contrasted statesmen and leaders. They have been willing to consider Lee and Jackson and Johnston in contrast with Grant and Sherman and Thomas, from a purely military standpoint, as if they were merely players in a great game of chess, in which skill alone, and not manhood, was to be taken into account—as if the question of loyalty to the Nation were a mere accident, for which the one class were entitled to no credit and the other deserving of no disparagement. This has gone so far that there was even a tendency to forget altogether the fact that a war could not be waged for the preservation of the Union unless some one was responsible for the attempt to destroy it.

Posterity will hold that the first duty of every man, North and South alike, was the active and zealous support of the Union cause. It will no more excuse apathy than it will condone hostility. It may, indeed, admit sincerity of purpose and honesty of conviction as a mitigating circumstance, but by no means a justification. It will say of one class, they thought they were right, but *were* wrong; of the other, they not only thought themselves in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the right, but *were* right. History does not excuse errors. The present may condone faults, but the future is relentless in its condemnation of wrong.

In nothing is the truth of what has been said more clearly shown than in the revision of the popular estimate of the central figure of that time. Twenty-six years ago the first life of Abraham Lincoln was written. It was a campaign book intended to say all that could be said of its subject, and pass lightly over anything that might be considered detrimental to his popularity. This biographical introduction to the American people was followed by many others in the same vein. Except his own speeches we had no other knowledge of the man until he came to assume the executive control of the nation. In these latter, indeed, the true man shone and the instinct of the people recognized it. Yet despite their strengh, simplicity and marvelous diction, he came to the discharge of his great task entirely uncomprehended by the intellect and culture of the land. To friend and foe alike he was only a lucky accident—a western circuit lawyer, noted for his power to wheedle backwoods juries and lead the coarse mirth that flowed about the tavern fire. His life was simple, honest, able and his record singularly clear from public or private wrong.

Doubtless a vast majority of the Republican party, when once they found themselves successful, regretted that instead of the inexperienced backwoodsman, they did not have in the Presidential chair the scholarly and veteran Seward, or the astute and plausible Chase. In truth, it was mainly because these men were called into his Cabinet that the party gave that confidence to his Administration at the outset that it did. They had the most unswerving confidence in his purity, and almost equal confidence in their skill. They believed him incapable of intentional wrong, and thought his advisers would show him how to do right.

With modifications, this estimate of his character has continued until recent times. While justice has been done to his patriotism, patience, and humanity, it is only recently that his intellectual capacity has been generally recognized and admitted, whether by friend or foe. Even the lives of Lincoln published after his death have, until recently, proceeded more or less upon this hypothesis. Dr. Holland's work is devoted chiefly to the laudation of his motive, and leaves the impression that he was favored by Providence because of his beneficence and simplicity, as fools are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

specially cared for. Mr. Raymond's "Life," which is expressly valuable, as showing his relation to the cabal in the Army of the Potomac and the difficulties that surrounded him in the selection of commanders and the administration of the army, still leaves a feeling of pity for the "Great Uncouth," who, innocent of the ways of the world, had strayed from the wilds of Illinois into that den of lions, the capital of the United States, to be torn and baffled by those stronger and wiser.

These and kindred works induced the general belief that he was the tool now of one cabinet officer and now of another; controlled now by this cabal and anon by that. The fact that he was able to harmonize his cabinet at all was believed to be dependent on a sort of low cunning by which he played one against the other. This impression was deepened by the unique biography bearing the imprimatur of Mr. Ward H. Lamon, which seems to have been written with the sole purpose of belittling every quality of its subject, except his power to deceive.

Within a few years, however, a broader knowledge resulting from fuller investigation—the connotation of views and philosophic study of his character, have made necessary the revision of the accepted judgment.

The works in regard to the central character of the epoch of rebellion which have recently appeared, are among the most significant fruits of this renaissance of national thought.

A little more than a year ago the most distinguished of living Confederate generals declared, in an article in one of our great magazines, that Mr. Lincoln "was a man matchless among forty millions in his fitness for the place he held and the task he had to perform." So far as is known, no one, even among his countrymen of the South, has dared to take issue with him. On the contrary, one scarce less distinguished than himself in the support of the Confederate cause, openly laments that the chief executive of that evanescent republic was not his equal, and attributes to that fact the ill success of the rebellion.

Soon after one of our leading journals, referring to this revision of opinion in regard to Lincoln, said: "The people of the country, and especially those living at the East, are *just beginning* to appreciate the intellectual character of Abraham Lincoln." A half decade ago either of these utterances would have caused a smile, if not a sneer.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The first and most important of the works which has compelled this readjustment of the general estimate of the "Liberator" and his contemporaries, is that very remarkable "Life of Abraham Lincoln," prepared by Mr. Isaac N. Arnold. It gives for the first time the view of a competent observer as to the intellectual growth and character of Mr. Lincoln. The author—himself a man of no mean ability—was a professional and political friend of Mr. Lincoln from his first entrance into political life until his death. A man himself of entire intellectual uprightness, he appreciated the sincerity of Mr. Lincoln's character, and saw that what others mistook for cunning, if not hypocrisy, was the simple result of his conviction. He does not paint a being of superhuman characteristics, but a man large and fair in intellectual power and attributes at the first, who grew steadily in power without receding a whit in his moral character or losing any of that intellectual honesty which made a conclusion once reached a constant factor in his political conviction—a man to whom truth and policy were one and the same thing, not because "honesty is the best policy," but because it was the only policy he could pursue.

Next came the work of Mr. William O. Stoddard. This beside being complementary of Mr. Arnold's volume, in setting forth with peculiar clearness certain phases of his early life and growth, shows more distinctly than has ever before been done, the difficulties attending the conciliation of the Border States, the paramount necessity of preventing their defection, and the exquisite skill of the backwoods president in dealing with this vexed question during the first months of his power.

Following this comes the volume of "Reminiscences of Abraham Lincoln," written by prominent men, who were not only his contemporaries but more or less closely associated with him at some period of his career, compiled by Mr. Allen Thorndike Rice. Probably no collection of reminiscences of any great man ever embraced the observations and conclusions of so many men able to observe carefully, decide justly, and express accurately as this. As a rule, too, the articles are written by men who are capable of sufficient self-effacement to enable them to exercise a candid discrimination in regard to the conduct and attributes of the man of whom they write, so far as their knowledge of the circumstances under which he acted might extend.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One of the most distinguished patriots of that era said to the writer, soon after Mr. Lincoln's death :

"It is a great misfortune ; for it will now be a quarter of a century, at least, before the world will learn just what sort of a man Abraham Lincoln was." It is probable if Mr. Wade had lived until now that he would have seen, as many of these writers evidently do, that he then very imperfectly apprehended a character so great and many-sided that, like a statue of heroic size, his character needs distance, elevation, and the perspective of events to show its true proportions and essential harmony.

These facts show something of the extent of this revival of interest and inquiry. There can be no doubt that the American people have thought and read more upon this subject during the past two years than upon any other—perhaps very nearly as much as upon all others—and far more than in the ten years since the half decade succeeding the close of the struggle.

Among the more notable results is the fact that it would be hard to find an intelligent man who would be willing to question the intellectual pre-eminence of Mr. Lincoln or the absolute devotion of Grant to the cause of the Republic. It has come to the masses of our people almost as a revelation that this backwoods lawyer was not only a man of tender heart and exalted patriotism, but of the most commanding intellectual power and the most varied and abundant resources. Instead of being ruled by his cabinet or used as the instrument of any clique or cabal among his supporters, he was able to harmonize the most conflicting elements and utilize the most refractory influence. Within three months after his inauguration we find him teaching the diplomats how to avoid difficulty without yielding to dictation, no doubt saving us from war with England, by his verbal corrections of one of the most important dispatches ever drawn by our State Department. We learn from his commanding generals, that whether in the beleaguered capital or under the fire of the enemy's guns, he always showed the same calm, unshrinking courage.

We have come at length to know that this man of whom our scholars have been wont to speak half-apologetically as an accident of democratic institutions, showing how ready are the uninformed rabble to prefer the popular, rather than the capable, leader, was not only the equal but the superior of all those by whom he was surrounded, in that tact and skill which go to make up the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

statesman, and that courage, integrity, and devotion to the common weal which constitute the patriot. But most remarkable, perhaps, of all, the literary world finds itself almost reluctantly compelled to admit that this uncouth Esop, with the twang of the West and South in his speech, was easily the master of all men of his time, in ready, accurate and forceful use of the English tongue. There were orators, statesmen, and scholars galore, in that wonderful epoch. The hearts of the North and the South were stirred to their depths. Strangely enough, the South, which has always boasted of the forensic genius of its people, hardly produced a solitary effusion that has any chance of becoming classic, while our Northern literature is adorned with many gems of prose and verse that are destined to immortality. But among them all there is not one that will live in history as the equal in power, in elegance, in breadth of philosophy and perfection of diction, as well as in subtle harmony with the circumstances and surroundings in which they were uttered, with the Gettysburg oration and the second inaugural address of Abraham Lincoln. The revival of nationalism in our literature has taught us already, that we can only appreciate his character when we look at him over the heads of those by whom he was surrounded.

ALBION W. TOURGÉE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOCIALISM: ITS FALLACIES AND DANGERS.

THERE are so many grades and shades of diverse opinion loosely included in and attacked or defended as Socialism, that it is necessary to briefly make clear what it is that I attack in this paper. I understand and define Socialism as denying all individual private property, and as affirming that society, organized as the State, should own all wealth, direct all labor, and compel the equal distribution of all produce. I understand a socialistic State to be that State in which everything would be common as to its user, and in which all labor would be controlled by the State, which, from the common stock, would maintain the laborer and would take all the produce of the labor. That is, I identify Socialism with Communism.

In England this definition, though admitted by some Socialist writers and speakers, is challenged by many honest, earnest Socialists, whose objections are entitled to respect; but, the more carefully I examine their several positions, the more thoroughly I am disposed to adhere to the above definition. Many who describe themselves as Socialists I should describe as social reformers, and with them I have little or no quarrel. There are some who attempt to explain Socialism so as to distinguish it from Communism. "Socialism," says Mr. Besant, "merely implies that the raw material of the soil and the means of production shall not be the private property of individuals, but shall be under the control of the community; it leaves intact a man's control over himself and over the value of his work—subject to such general laws as are necessary in any community—but, by socializing land and capital, it deprives each of the power of enslaving his fellows and of living in idleness on the results of their labor instead of on the result of his own" (Modern Socialism, p. 10). A great deal in this sentence turns on what is meant by "means of production." Does it, at the same time, include the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rudest implement, the huge iron works and plant, and the most minute, delicate, and costly tools? Does it mean that in every-day life each citizen has equal right to require the State to place at her or his sole disposal, uncontrolled, and for such period as the worker may please, such "raw material" and "means of production" as the worker is of opinion are necessary to enable him to get the best value for his labor? If yes, where is the control of the means of production by the community? If no, how can the scheme leave intact a man's control over himself, and over the value of his work? How is the willful damage or the deterioration of the means of production, by an incapable worker, to be guarded against? How is the abandonment of a difficult industry to be prevented? How are the instruments of production to be obtained by the laborer, and on what conditions, and under what security that they will be surrendered to, and kept in good condition for, the State? and if three laborers require instruments of production of a kind of which there only exists sufficient for two laborers, what is to happen? How is the State, in furnishing the raw material and means of production, to determine between a man who thinks he can manufacture a medicine; one who believes that he can make a watch; one who hopes that he can execute a marble statue; one who is confident that he can make a microscope; one who is sure that he can build an aërial ship; one who guesses that he can find coal in an untried district; and one who thinks that he can fill a tub of coal or wagon of ironstone by means of a shaft already sunken? Is the determination to be made by authorities locally chosen to act in such localities or nationally chosen to act for the whole country? and how will it be possible to avoid favoritism between hard and easy fashions of labor? If the State leaves intact a man's control over himself, this determination is impossible.

Whoever, on behalf of the State, is guardian of the raw material and means of production, must either in each case determine the kind of labor for which the man or woman is best fitted, or he must allot, first come first served, without reference to fitness. If all raw material is to be the property of the State, may the person who has, in the process of manufacture, added value to some portion, take the whole of that portion away to a foreign market where he believes the highest value will be obtainable for it and for his work upon it? If yes, how is the State to be sure that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

value of its raw material will ever come back? If the State is to control the sale of the finished article, where is the worker's intact control of the value of his work? Mr. Hyndman says: "Socialism is an endeavor to substitute for the anarchical struggle or fight for existence, an organized co-operation for existence."* I note on this, that while the struggle for existence has been clearly far too bitter, not only as between employer and employed, but also as between the workers themselves, and has certainly been most oppressive on the poorest and weakest, "anarchical" is an absurd word of description, and that the vitality of the whole definition depends on the translation of the words "organized co-operation." Voluntary co-operation is organized co-operation determinable by the will of each co-operator, as far as he or she is concerned, and subject to the conditions agreed to as to such withdrawal, but this clearly is not what is meant by Mr. Hyndman. When in debate I pressed for explanation, it was refused, and Mr. J. L. Joynes, a prominent Socialist and one of the best educated among them, wrote in rebuke of my demand that "no 'scientific' Socialist pretends to have any scheme or detailed plan of organization." They only pretend to desire to destroy existing society because of its evils; to-morrow may grow, if and how it can, without the slightest precaution against the development of a worse state. What Mr. Hyndman meant by anarchy he thus explained: "There is many a man who works as a skilled laborer to-day, who if a machine is invented whereby man may benefit, will be turned out to compete against his fellows on the streets to-morrow. That is what I say is anarchy." And as the cure for this he asked for "the collective ownership of land, capital, machinery, and credit by the complete ownership of the people." As to labor-saving machinery, or cost-reducing machinery, or produce-increasing machinery, it is true that as each new invention is introduced, the introduction very often renders it necessary that persons who have pursued one method of earning their livelihood shall adopt new methods and there is often difficulty in finding new employment. If the worker is advanced in life, it is very difficult for him to adapt himself to other labor. But it is not true that the introduction of machinery has permanently reduced the number of workers in the country where most machinery is used, nor is it true that the rate

* All the quotations from Mr. Hyndman are from the debate with myself: "Will Socialism benefit the English People?"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of pauperism has, on the whole, increased in the countries where the most machinery has been introduced. Mr. Hyndman's definition means communism or it means nothing. If the collective ownership of everything by everybody is not the total negation of private property, then words have no value.

Many so-called socialistic experiments have been tried in various parts of the world, but none of these have yet been permanently successful. Such as have seemed temporarily to achieve a certain measure of success have been held together: (1) By some religious or quasi-religious tie, and those have in turn broken up when the effect of the tie has weakened; or (2) by personal devotion to some one man, and these have broken up when the man has died or grown weary; or (3) while directed by some strong chief or chiefs, and holding together only so long as the direction endured. And even the temporary success has only been maintained whilst the community were few in number. Whenever an apparent success tempted many recruits, then the experiment collapsed, and this because, whilst the members in the community were limited, the individual members of the community did not lose sight of the personal advantages accruing from their individual exertions. Each small community held its own property hostile to, or, at least, clearly distinguishable from, the property of other individuals, or communities, dwelling near. Every individual of the so-called socialistic community could estimate the addition to the common stock, the owners of which were so limited in number that he could calculate his share of the increased wealth. The incentive to increased exertion was constant in the hope of increased well-being, and in some of the communities the individual members had and often exercised an option of withdrawal, taking away with them on leaving a proportion of the property created or increased. But none of the communistic experiments, either in the United States or in this country, have been more than large co-operative enterprises, the property of the adventurers belonging to the corporate body. And there is little doubt that these experiments have done something to produce—as in the case of the Familistère of M. Godin—some modifications of the more unpleasant side of the fiercely competitive struggle for existence, and that they did pave the way, at any rate in England, for the co-operative institutions, which for exchange and distribution have already been eminently successful. And though co-operative enterprises for produc-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion have yet done comparatively little, it is in this direction that I look for the utilization of the best in modern socialistic energy.

Modern Socialism is more ambitious of exercising State authority, and is therefore more dangerous than was the socialism of fifty years ago. The socialism of Owen, Cabet and Frances Wright was the experiment, in each case of a few, in their own persons, at their own risk and cost, patiently conducted, and, even in failure, giving example of great devotion and much self-reliant effort. Modern Socialists claim to experiment with the State as a whole, and without waiting even to convert the majority. Modern Socialism appeals to the poorest and most hungry to break up all accumulated wealth. It works chiefly by denunciations of the rich and well fed. It has no patience to gradually build up a new system; it regards reform as its enemy; it proposes to begin by destroying the existing state of things. Unfortunately, the social evils in all old countries are great and sore, but if they are to be diminished they must be reformed in detail; there is no magic four-leaved shamrock at the disposal of the reformer. The worst and most mischievous advocates of Socialism are those who justify and encourage the unemployed in the use of force—and especially of the terrible phase of force revealed by modern chemistry, as an agent in changing the present state of society. In some countries Socialists call themselves "Anarchists," repudiating alike all law, rejecting all directing government; in other countries they call themselves "Social Democrats," and call upon the State to feed, clothe, and employ those who are ill fed, badly clothed, or lack employment. These Socialists are the real enemies of progress, they afford excuse to those who desire reaction. The State can give the people neither food, nor clothing, nor work, save to the extent, and as the citizens themselves, provide the State with the means to do these things. If the State is to do for each individual that which the individual is unable to do for himself, then if it be done at all it can only be done by a despotism. State Socialism is utterly at variance with individual liberty; it is totally hostile to the institutions of a free democracy.

Great publicity has been recently obtained in England, and chiefly in London, for a comparatively small knot of men, styling themselves "Social Democrats," and also describing themselves as "Scientific Socialists," some of whom give us ill-digested versions of German Socialism. They have, like the Salvation Army,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been chiefly prominent in holding meetings, to the detriment of traffic, in inconvenient places, whilst convenient places were disregarded by them. By these means they have brought on their heads several police prosecutions, which prosecutions had the color of unfairness as being directed against hysteric Socialism, while hysteric Salvation-armyism escaped scot free. They have also succeeded in provoking a criminal prosecution by the use of language which, if it had any meaning, was in the highest degree inflammatory and exciting, but which language was held not to be connected with or intended to provoke the riotous results which followed its use. These men have, however, neither the influence nor the devotedness of the men who preached and practiced experimental Socialism under Robert Owen from 1817, and who, fifty years ago, were stirring the whole of the midland and northern counties of England, holding great meetings and establishing scores of halls and institutions in the northern towns. The new Social Democrats, while calling loudly for the dissolution of the present social state, denied that they ought to be called upon to produce or formulate any scheme for the government of the society which is to follow the revolution they acclaim, and they refuse to discuss any of the details of life in the proposed new social state; though they profess at once to be ready by force, argument failing, to destroy what exists in order to make way for what they desire. Mr. Hyndman, professing to be a leader of the Social Democrats, declares that "force, or fear of force, is unfortunately the only reasoning which can appeal to a dominant estate, or which will even induce them to surrender any portion of their property." A socialist State, if it could be realized by force, which I do not believe, could only so be realized after a shocking and murderous civil war; a war which, however it ended, would leave, for more than one generation, legacies of bitter hate and of demoralizing desire for revenge.

The Social Democrats mix up in their programme some desirable objects which are not at all socialistic, with others that are not necessarily socialistic. They then add declarations conflicting in character, which are either so vague as to be meaningless, or are else, in the highest degree, communistic and revolutionary. They call for the "organization of agricultural and industrial armies under State control" and claim "that the exchange of all production should be controlled by the workers," but they decline

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to explain how this is to be done, or to meet detail objections urged against the feasibility of the proposals. All labor under State control means the utter stagnation of special industrial effort; the neutralization of almost all industrial enterprise; the stoppage of the most efficient incentive to inventive initiative. What can the organization and control of all labor by the State mean? In what would it end? By whom and in what manner would the selection of each individual be determined for the pursuit, profession, or handicraft for which he was deemed fittest? Would resistance or refusal on the part of any individual to perform the labor for which he had been selected be treated as crime? Would preference for any other kind of labor than that allotted be allowed? I am told that thus I am raising undue difficulties, but I want at least to know how the new State machine will work before I consent to suddenly break up the old one. That there are many evils in connection with exchange and distribution is true. In many departments there are too many concerned in the distribution of the necessaries of life, as brokers, merchants, and retailers, and the cost to the consumer is thus unnecessarily and outrageously augmented. But this can be cured by the gradual extension of the co-operative distributive institutions and stores which have already proved so useful. These co-operative societies, whilst rendering the cost of exchange less onerous and otherwise improving its character, also encourage habits of thrift and self-reliant effort on the part of the individual members. In a socialistic state there would be no inducement to thrift; no encouragement to, no reward for, individual saving; no protection for individual accumulation; no check upon, no discouragement to individual waste. If the establishment of a socialistic State be conceived possible, it is certainly not possible to imagine such a State co-existing with free expression of individual opinion, either on platform or through the press. All means of publicity in a socialistic State will belong to and will be controlled by the State. It is not conceivable that a socialistic government would provide halls for its adversaries to agitate for its overthrow, print books and pamphlets for its opponents to show that its methods and actions were mischievous; organize costly journals and give the conduct to hostile men to excite public feeling—and yet if all this were not done, utter stagnation of opinion is the only possible result. The "Social Democrats" urge that the "surplus value" of labor is "the keystone of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

socialistic argument." They say, "the laborers on the average replace the value of their wages for the capitalist class in the first few hours of their day's work; the exchange value of the goods produced in the remaining hours of the day's work constitutes so much embodied labor which is unpaid; and this unpaid labor, so embodied in articles of utility, the capitalist class, the factory owners, the farmers, the bankers, the brokers, the shopkeepers and their hangers-on, the landlords, divide amongst themselves in the shape of profits, interests, discounts, commissions, rent, etc." Is it at all true that wages and other outlay by the capitalist are replaced in the first few hours? Are not the large fortunes more usually the result of exploitation on a very large scale, a small daily profit being secured on each workman? And without the capitalist where would be the workshop, the plant, or the raw material? It would be far better if, in co-operative production, workmen would be their own capitalists; but surely the owner of the capital, without which the exploitation cannot take place, is entitled to some reward. If not, what becomes the first inducement to economy and enterprise? How is the capitalist to be persuaded to put his savings into fixed capital as factory and plant? Why should he, beforehand, purchase raw material on which labor may be employed, and the value of which raw material may diminish? Why should he subsist labor while so employed and take the risk of loss in exchanging the article produced, unless he is to have some profit? And why should not the farmer be sustained by the laborer if that farmer grows the food on which he subsists while working? Why should not the shopkeeper be rewarded for bringing ready to the laborer articles which would be otherwise difficult in the highest degree for the laborer to procure? If the laborer was obliged to procure his own raw material, to fashion it into an exchangeable commodity, and then had to find the person with whom he might exchange it, there are many to whom the raw material would be unaccessible, and more who would lose much of the profits of their labor in fruitless efforts to exchange. But for capital, fixed and circulating, there are many natural objects which would be utterly inaccessible to labor; many more which could only be reached and dealt with on a very limited scale. But for capital, the laborer would often be unable to exist until the object had an exchangeable value, or until some one was found ready with an equivalent article and desiring to exchange, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the banker, the broker, the shopkeeper, though they are, unfortunately, sometimes too greedy for gain, may and do facilitate the progress of labor, and would not and could not do so without the incentive of profit.

It is too true that "wage" is often much too low, and that the conditions of labor are often oppressive, and to meet this I urge the workers in each trade to join the unions already existing, and to form new unions, so that the combined knowledge and protection of the general body of workers may be at the service of the weakest and most ignorant. It is for this that I obtained from the House of Commons last February the establishment of a labor statistical department under the Board of Trade, so that careful and reliable statistics of the value of labor and cost of living may be easily accessible to the poorest laborers. I would further urge the more thorough experiment in, and establishment of, co-operative productive societies in every branch of manufacture, so that the laborers, directly furnishing their own capital, as well as their own industry, may not only increase the profit result of labor to the laborer, but may also afford at least a reasonable indication of the possible profit realized by capitalists engaged in the same kind of industries. I would also increase wage (if not in amount, at any rate in its purchasing power) by diminishing the national and local expenditure, especially the national expenditure for warlike purposes, thus decreasing the cost of the necessaries of life. I would, so far as Great Britain is concerned, try to shift the pressing burden of taxation from labor more on to land, and on to the very large inherited accumulations of wealth.

Socialism is dangerous in England, because it claims to be revolutionary in an age and in a country where the most extensive reforms have been peacefully effected during the past fifty years, and where the enormously wide extension of political power gives opportunity for the acceleration of the many reforms yet required. Socialism is dangerous here, for its present advocacy is hysterical, not practical. While I do not believe that Socialism can make the revolution its advocates menace, I do believe it may make disorder, turmoil, riot, and disturbance. Socialism, as advocated by the Social Democrats, is especially dangerous, because it furnishes excuse to reaction, and gives occasion for the possible restriction of the right of public meeting; a right which has so much aided political progress in this country during the present century. I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may, perhaps, be permitted to terminate this article by repeating, with very slight variation, the words I used on April 17th, 1884, at the close of my debate with Mr. H. M. Hyndman, the elected representative of the Social Democratic Federation, at which debate fully 5,000 persons were present.

You say you desire revolution—you say you are clamoring for it. These are the words you use. You say: "We are urging it on;" and I say it is the duty of every honest man to delay and prevent revolution. Revolution, if it must come, is terrible; if it must come, it is horrible; revolution means ruined homes, it leaves behind the memory of bloody deeds. I speak for the English people, which through generations of pain and toil gradually has climbed towards liberty, the liberty of which they have won some glimpses, and towards which they are climbing still. I speak for the people—who are ready to suffer much if they may redeem somewhat, who know that the errors of yesterday cannot be sponged away in a moment to-day, and who would try slowly, gradually, to mold, to modify, to build, but who refuse to destroy, and who declare that those who preach international Socialism, and talk vaguely about explosives, are playing into the hands of our enemies, and giving our enemies an excuse to coerce us.

C. BRADLAUGH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PROGRESS OF MINNESOTA.

A STATEMENT is desired of the progress of Minnesota since the civil war. This period so nearly coincides with its existence as a State that an extension of the sketch may be pardonable.

A territorial government was established for Minnesota by act of Congress of March 3, 1849, under which the first Governor, Alexander Ramsey, entered upon his duties June 23, 1849. On the 26th of February, 1857, Congress passed an act authorizing the formation of a constitution for admission into the Union. A constitution was accordingly adopted and the officers provided for therein elected on the 13th of October following, and upon the formal admission of the State by Congress, May 11, 1858, the "North Star" rose upon our national azure.

Minnesota lies between the parallels 43° 30′ and 49° of latitude. Its western boundary is cut by the ninety-seventh meridian, but without great divergence, and its very irregular eastern boundary gives it an average breadth of about five degrees. Its area is 53,943,379 acres, of which about 3,608,000 acres are covered by the waters of more than 7,500 interior lakes. It occupies the centre of the great interior plain of the continent, containing the head waters of the Mississippi, flowing into the Gulf of Mexico; of the Red River of the North, whose waters seek the Arctic Ocean, and the sources of streams which, through the great lakes and the St. Lawrence River, reach the Atlantic. The head of steamboat navigation, also, in all of these water-ways, is in the North Star State.

The population of Minnesota, according to the earliest census, taken June 11, 1849, was 4,513. By the enumeration of 1857, preparatory to admission, it was 150,037. The financial disasters and prostration of business in 1857 checked the growth and prosperity of the young State, and the war of the rebellion drained it of men. The massacres by the Sioux Indians in 1862, previous to their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

final removal from the State, frightened away the timid of the settlers, and a storm of unexampled severity in January, 1871, was used to prejudice us with the seekers of new homes, by agents of competing areas in favor of which degrees of latitude were thought to testify. But the following census figures of population show an increase marvelous as a whole, and in some periods almost unparalleled: In 1860, 172,023; 1865, 250,099; 1870, 439,706; 1875, 597,407; 1880, 780,773; 1885, 1,117,798.

Of the total population in 1880, 513,097 were born in the United States, while of the foreign born, over 25 per cent. were German, 9 per cent. were Irish, 40 per cent. Scandinavian, less than 5 per cent. British, and about 8 per cent. native of other European countries. This mixture of foreign blood in the proportions above shown tends to the maintenance in perfection of a stock drawn originally from almost the same sources, rather than to its deterioration.

How are these people thriving?

The total valuation of the property in the State, as assessed for taxation and excluding all statutory exemptions, was, in certain years convenient for comparison, as follows: In 1849, $514,936; in 1860, $36,743,408; in 1880, $258,055,543; in 1885, $399,789,766; and in 1886, $458,424,777. The above includes no railroad property, all of which is exempt from assessment, the railroad companies paying to the State a percentage of their gross earnings in lieu of all other taxes. This percentage amounted to $642,258 for the fiscal year ending July 31, 1886.

The wealth of the people per capita was, in 1849, $114.10; in 1860, $213.59; in 1880, $330.51; and in 1885, $357.65.

The number of persons of both sexes engaged in all gainful avocations enumerated in the federal census of 1880 was 255,125. Of these 131,535 were in agriculture, 59,452 in professional and personal services, 24,349 in trade and transportation, and 39,789 in manufacturing, mechanical, and mining pursuits. Some indications will be quoted of progress in all of these occupations, except those of the second group, the prosperity of which, as a whole, is measurable by that of the other classes.

The whole number of farms in 1860 was 18,181, containing on the average 149 acres; in 1880, 92,386 farms averaged 145 acres. The acres of improved land in farms in 1860 was 556,250; in 1880, 7,246,693. The unimproved land was 79.5 per cent. of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

total land in farms in 1860; in 1880, only 45.9 per cent. In 1860 the value of farms, including fences and buildings, was $27,505,922, and of farming implements and machinery, $1,018,-183; in 1880, the value of farms was $193,724,460, and of farm machinery, $13,089,783.

The direction of agricultural effort is recently changing from the almost exclusive growing of the cereals, and principally wheat, to a more mixed farming, especially to stock raising and dairy products. Much attention is paid to the improvement of breed of both horses and cattle, and to the manufacture of superior butter and cheese. At the New Orleans Exposition in 1884–5, Minnesota butter took the first premiums against all competitors. This success was deserved and expected, and has just been repeated at Chicago. It goes without saying that the best wheat and the finest flour were found in her exhibit at New Orleans, but that her fruit growers took the first prizes there for apples and grapes, was a surprise to those who did not remember that the Wilder medal for finest fruit exhibit had been previously won by Minnesota at the Philadelphia Exhibition of the American Pomological Society in 1883.

The course and progress of our agriculture may be seen at a glance from the figures taken from the United States censuses of 1860 and 1880, and the State statistical volume of 1885, each of which reports products of the year before its date:

	1860.	1880.	1885.
Wheat (bushels)	2,186,993	34,601,030	50,475,013
Barley	109,668	2,972,965	7,001,526
Corn	2,941,952	14,831,741	16,761,495
Oats	2,176,002	23,382,158	36,978,079
Potatoes	2,565,485	5,184,676	6,583,844
Flax seed	.....	99,378*	1,486,527
Grass seed	.....	30,376*	286,794
Hay (tons)	179,482	1,636,912	2,296,402
Wool (pounds)	20,388	1,352,124	2,070,213
Butter	2,957,673	19,161,385	32,000,000†
Cheese	199,314	523,138	4,000,000†
Milk sold (gallons)	.....	1,504,407	6,000,000†
Value of all live stock	$3,642,841	$31,904,821	.....

Agriculture remains the occupation of the majority of the inhabitants, but recently commercial and manufacturing pursuits

* From State report. Not given in the United States Compendium.
† Estimate of State Dairy Commissioner for 1886.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are rapidly coming forward, and the increase of population tends to the cities. This is illustrated by the astonishing growth since 1880 of Minneapolis and Saint Paul, those contiguous "cities which, like double stars, are separate to their dwellers, yet which, to the observer, seem but one."

	Minneapolis.	St. Paul.	Both cities.
1880	46,887	41,473	88,360
1885	129,200	111,397	240,597

The paid-up capital stock of the banking institutions in the State, June, 1884, was $16,294,099; their surplus, $2,310,144; and the deposits, except those in private banks which are unknown, $27,339,949. In 1886, their capital was $20,149,100; surplus, $3,195,836; and deposits, $34,992,873. The bank capital and surplus of Saint Paul is $8,115,885; of Minneapolis, $7,027,066.

The wholesale trade of Saint Paul rose from $36,948,983 in 1881 to $81,195,836 in 1885; that of Minneapolis amounted to $33,136,000 in 1881 and to $61,082,200 in 1885. Sales of flour and lumber from mills are not included.

The first railroad construction was of ten miles in 1862. The completed miles numbered 1,092 in 1870; 3,099 in 1880; 4,226 in 1885, and at the close of 1886, 4,951 miles will be ready for operation.

Since 1868 the State has published very full agricultural statistics, but has adopted no adequate means for obtaining returns of other industries. The United States furnishes the following regarding manufactures:

	1860.	1870.	1880.
Number of establishments	562	2,270	3,493
Number of hands employed	2,123	11,290	21,247
Capital invested	$2,388,310	$11,993,729	$31,004,811
Wages paid	712,214	4,052,837	8,613,094
Value of materials	1,904,070	13,842,902	55,660,681
Value of products	3,373,172	23,110,700	76,065,18

Sawed lumber was the first manufactured product of Minnesota, and remains second in importance to that of flour. The values of the lumber cut, as reported by federal censuses since 1850, were $57,800, $816,808, $4,378,191, and $7,366,038. The lumber product of 1886, it is estimated, will amount to 960,000,000 feet of pine, with the equivalent of ten per cent. additional

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in shingles and lath, and 40,000,000 feet of hard wood. The total value will be fully $14,000,000. About one-third of the pine is sawed at Minneapolis, about one-sixth at Stillwater, the same at Winona, and nearly as much at and near Duluth.

The products of the flour and grist mills were in 1850, $500 in value; in 1860, $1,300; in 1870, $5,718,887, and in 1880, $41,519,004. Wheat was the material used for more than 98 per cent. of the above. There will have been, in round numbers, 8,500,000 barrels of flour made in the State in 1886, more than three-fourths of it being the output of Minneapolis mills.

The production of building materials other than lumber is very rapidly increasing; red and cream-colored brick, gray and white limestone, white, pink, and brown sandstone, gray and black granite, lime, cement, and artificial stone.

Mining is an infant industry with us. Iron mines are opened at Tower, from which the first shipments of ore were made in 1884, of 62,124 tons. Eleven hundred men are now employed in them, and the shipments in 1886 amounted to 305,954 tons.

So much for the material thrift of State and people. What is their provision for education of youth, for care of incapables, for repression of crime, for preservation of health, for moral growth?

The theory of the Minnesota educational system is that the State shall furnish free instruction to every resident child, in common and grammar schools, high schools, the university and professional schools. The system is fully adopted and is in operation as far up as the university and such professional schools as are already established.

One-eighteenth of all the land in the State is devoted to form a permanent school fund, which, already amounting to $7,311,898, will probably finally reach $18,000,000, or $20,000,000. In addition to the revenue from this fund, taxes are levied annually at the pleasure of each district for the support of common and graded schools. From the aggregate thus obtained in 1885, which was $2,442,612, schools were maintained in 5,234 districts, employing 7,136 teachers, and having 243,059 pupils enrolled between the ages of five and twenty-one years. There were 346 new school-houses built that year, at a cost of $508,070. The value of all school-houses and sites is $6,906,166; of school apparatus, $97,243; and of school libraries, $31,796.

High schools, fifty-nine in number, assisted by appropriations

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of State funds and subject to examination by a State High School Board, prepare students for the State University. Graduates from grammar schools may enter the high schools, and graduates of the high schools may enter any college or university in the State without further examination.

The University has a special grant of lands for its support and receives large appropriations annually. It now has a faculty of 30 professors and instructors, and numbers 406 students, of whom 25 are post-graduates, 113 are in the preparatory, or sub-freshman class, 86 in the artisans' training school, and 50 are pursuing special courses. The Agricultural College, now a part of the University, operates an Experimental Farm of 250 acres. The invested fund of the University amounts to $851,526, to which the sale of its remaining grant will add $400,000; its grounds, buildings, and apparatus are valued at $983,000; its library contains 10,000 volumes and its museum 20,000 specimens.

Three Normal schools, with twelve to fifteen instructors each, apparatus, libraries, model schools, etc., taught 1,565 learners the last year and graduated 98 teachers. Their grounds, buildings, and equipment are of the value of $350,000.

A school for the deaf and the dumb, one for the blind, and one for imbeciles, are among our most favored and most successful institutions. Their structures and sites represent investments of $300,000.

Besides these State educational institutions, many private schools exist, and, notably, denominational colleges, or those under the special care of various religious denominations, as Episcopalians, Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, Congregationalists, Lutherans, and Catholics.

The insane are cared for in two asylums, in which adequate accommodations are afforded for 1,600 patients. Inebriates may become the subjects of treatment in these. A third asylum is now locating, and its construction will be commenced another season.

Several orphan asylums are supported by private and municipal bounty.

The one State prison has at length been found insufficient for this day, especially as it does not permit the separation of first term offenders, of whose reclamation there is reasonable hope, from the older and hardened criminals. Provision is made for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the location of a second prison, which will doubtless be of the kind known as reformatories. These prisons, with our most successful Reform School for juvenile offenders against the law, and for incorrigible children, and the State Public School, now just completed and opened, for the care of younger children of indigent or criminal parents, whose offspring might otherwise become criminal for want of attention and protection, will complete our system of correctional establishments. A non-partisan State Board of Corrections and Charities visits and examines all the penal, reformatory and eleemosynary institutions of the State, and, though without authority to manage or control either, by counsel and suggestion, and through recommendations to the Legislature, brings about co-operation in action and a better co-relation of functions of all.

A State Board of Health, acting largely by the agency of local boards, which it is authorized efficiently to direct, has proved itself adequate to protect against the spread of contagious and infectious diseases among men and also among domestic animals.

Derived from peoples long since civilized and Christian, the inhabitants of Minnesota inherit and cherish the religious character and morality of their ancestry. The church and Sunday-schools supplement the instruction of the secular schools. Vicious practice and crime are as infrequent as among any other equal population.

Such are the beginnings of the progress of Minnesota.

L. F. HUBBARD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FUTURE OF THE NATIONAL BANKING SYSTEM.

THE National Bank Act requires that banks having a capital of $150,000 and more than that amount, shall keep on deposit with the Treasurer of the United States not less than $50,000 of United States bonds as security for circulating notes, and that banks having a capital of less than $150,000 shall keep on deposit an amount equal to one-fourth of their capital as security for circulation. Circulation has ceased to be a profit, and, in many cases, is a burden to the National banks under existing laws. Many of the small banks of the country hesitate to organize under the National system, because they are obliged to buy United States bonds at the present high premium. Legislation is therefore suggested, which will authorize all banks having a capital in excess of $150,000 to keep on deposit $25,000 of United States bonds; and all banks having a capital of from $50,000 to $150,000, to keep on deposit an amount equal to one-eighth of their capital; or, what probably would be still better, authorize the smaller banks having a capital of from $50,000 to $75,000 to organize upon a deposit of $5,000, and banks with a capital of $75,000 and less than $150,000, to organize or continue business upon a deposit of $10,000 of United States bonds. This would permit all National banks which do not desire circulation, to conform to the law without the necessity of purchasing United States bonds at the present high rate of premium.

Such a bill would be improved if the amount of circulating notes to be issued should be increased to one hundred per cent. upon the par value of the bonds, instead of ninety per cent., as now authorized by law. This would be in accordance with the McPherson bill, which passed the Senate last winter, but which failed to pass the House. Indeed, the premium upon 4 per cent. and 4½ per cent. bonds is now so high in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

market, that the percentage of issue could be largely increased with safety to the bill holder. A law which authorizes the issue of ninety per cent. upon 3 per cents., worth only par in the market, and only ninety per cent. upon a 4 per cent. bond, worth 128 in the market, would seem to be imperfect. The holder of $100,000 of United States 4 per cent. bonds can readily borrow $120,000 in the New York market upon such bonds as collateral, and many banks hesitate to deposit bonds as security for circulation, which have a margin of more than one-third upon the amount of circulation issued. The rate of issue upon 4 per cent. and 4½ per cent. bonds should be increased to ninety per cent. upon the average market value of the bonds for the six months previous; and if, at any time, the security should be deemed to be insufficient, the Comptroller can call upon the banks for an increased amount, as now authorized by law, or the circulation can be reduced as the bank notes are redeemed from the five per cent. fund, deposited by the banks in Washington for that purpose, and the Treasurer can also be authorized to withhold the interest upon the bonds.

2. Provide for the refunding of the 4 per cent. bonds, amounting to $738,000,000 now outstanding, into 2½ or 3 per cent. bonds, offering the inducement to the holders of these bonds to exchange them for the new ones to be issued, the Government paying to the holders the difference between 2½ per cent., or 3 per cent., and 4 per cent.—the difference in value to be ascertained by an exact calculation by the Actuary of the Treasury Department.

If a farmer had a long mortgage upon his farm, bearing 8 per cent. interest, and he had the ready means to pay a portion of the amount, it would be a good proposition for him to offer the holder of the mortgage a payment of interest in advance, reducing the rate of interest upon his mortgage from eight per cent. to five per cent. if possible. There would be no difficulty in a farmer understanding a proposition like that. He would be able to use his ready means and improve his credit, and the transaction could be so arranged that the party to whom he made the payment would also be benefited by receiving his interest in advance.

In like manner the Government, having a large amount of surplus funds on hand, can use say 100 million dollars of that surplus by giving to the holders of the 4 per cent. bonds an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opportunity to exchange their 4s for a bond bearing a less rate of interest, the Government paying to the holders of the 4s the difference between that rate and a lesser rate for the next twenty years in advance.

It can be shown that such a proposition, if carried out, would be to the advantage not only of the Government, but also to the advantage of the bondholders. The former would reduce its surplus and really pay in advance a portion of its outstanding interest debt upon favorable terms, which otherwise it will be compelled to pay hereafter in annual installments for twenty years, and the latter would then have the use of a large amount of funds now invested in premiums which would be available for loans at rates greatly exceeding the borrowing power of the Government.*

It is believed that if the bill should pass authorizing the refunding of the fours into two-and-a-halfs, that the former would be presented to the Treasury for that purpose. United States bonds are held for a specific purpose. National banks hold them as security for circulating notes or for Government deposits. Savings banks and trust companies hold them as a reserve; and insurance companies and other corporations are required by law to deposit them with the State authorities. A bond of the United States bearing a less rate of interest could be used equally well for all these purposes.

If private individuals are the owners, it is because United States bonds are exempt from taxation, and afford to them, as they believe, the safest form of investment.

According to a report of the Actuary of the Treasury Department, an investment in the fours in the month of November last, realized to investors an average rate of interest of 2.32 per cent. only. The holder of the fours, by converting them into the new bonds, could still possess every advantage he now enjoys, and would realize a slightly increased rate of interest; while a large amount of principal now invested in premium, which is unremunerative,—in the aggregate more than 100 millions,—would be replaced in his hands for investment in United States bonds or in any other funds yielding a greater income.

The value of the new two-and-a-halfs could be increased, and the inducement to the holder to make the exchange also increased, by providing that the circulation to be issued upon the new bonds,

* Report of Comptroller of the Currency, 1882, p. 21.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when deposited by the National banks as security therefor, shall not be subject to the present tax of one per cent. per annum, or, if taxed, not exceeding one-half of one per cent., making the bonds more desirable as a basis for circulation than either the fours or the four-and-a-halfs, which will soon be the only bonds outstanding.

It would seem to be plain that if the necessary legislation is not obtainable from Congress for authorizing this conversion, it is not because the financial policy, and the necessity for such legislation, is not apparent.

If the rate were reduced to 2½ per cent., all the public debt of the United States would then, four years hence, in 1891, be at a lower rate of interest than that of any other government.

The Government will undoubtedly decline to purchase the 4s for its sinking fund at the present high rate of premium, but if it should authorize the payment of its interest in advance, and reduce this debt from the present rate to 2½ per cent., it could then, subsequently, if thought advisable, after the 4½s are paid, in the year 1891, purchase the new 2½ per cent. bonds then outstanding, which would be redeemable in the year 1907.

3. Provide a safety fund from the tax upon circulation, which should be reduced to ½ per cent. per annum, and from the estimated loss arising from the failure to present lost or worn out National bank notes for redemption during the last twenty years, amounting to about $4,500,000. When this safety fund amounts to $5,000,000, authorize the issue of circulating notes at the rate of $100,000 of circulation upon $80,000 of bonds; the loss, if any, from the inability of insolvent banks to redeem their circulating notes, to be charged and paid from this safety fund. The statistics in reference to the failure of National banks during the last twenty years shows that if circulation had been issued at the rate of $100,000 upon $80,000 of United States bonds deposited, there would have been no loss whatever to the holders of the circulating notes of insolvent banks. But with a safety fund in hand of $5,000,000, steadily increasing by a tax of one-half per cent. upon the circulation outstanding, there would be no possibility of loss to the holders of the notes of an insolvent National bank if such notes were issued at the rate of $100 for every $80 of United States bonds deposited.

The banks might also be authorized, at their option, to deposit

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in part gold or silver coin or bullion instead of United States bonds, and such a circulation would be greatly to be preferred to the silver certificates now in circulation.

If, however, the 4 per cent. bonds could be funded into 2½s by the payment of interest in advance, and circulation issued at par upon the bonds, and the present tax upon circulation repealed, the issues of the National banks could be maintained without the necessity of a safety fund, until the maturity of the bonds.

Either one of these propositions would give relief to the banks, and all combined would have the effect of continuing the National bank circulation for twenty years, or until the date of the payment of the 4 per cent. bonds now outstanding. Under such an arrangement the circulation of the National banks would not be likely to diminish, but would increase during the next twenty years. These propositions provide for an absolutely secure National bank circulation. They are eminently practicable and easy to execute, if the proper legislation can be obtained.

In any event, there is no reason why a law should not be passed authorizing National banks, if they desire, to reduce their circulation and the bonds required to be held as security therefor, and authorizing that circulation shall be issued at par upon the bonds, as previously provided in the McPherson bill. Surely all parties can agree to allow National banks to retire a portion of their circulation and their bonds, if they desire to do so.

The report of the Comptroller of the Currency for 1886 shows a decrease in the circulation of the National banks for the year ending November 1, 1884, of $24,170,676; in 1885, of $15,545,461, and in 1886, of $56,593,533, making a total of $96,309,670. The banks hold 57 millions of threes, all of which will be called in the course of a few months—reducing the circulation from 210 millions, the present amount, to about 170 millions during the coming midsummer months, and increasing the funds on deposit in the Treasury for the retirement of National bank notes from 88 millions on December 1 to nearly 120 millions.

It is evident that unless legislation is obtained during the present session of Congress, the National bank notes now outstanding are to be largely reduced, and that silver certificates are to be issued in their stead; but it does not follow that on this account the National banking system will cease to exist, for the system will continue as long as the banks continue to hold the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

minimum amount of bonds required by law. The banks which have been organized during the last few years have not been organized on account of the profit upon circulation, but rather because it is found by experience that a bank can more certainly build up a deposit account under the National system than any other. This is very evident from the numerous conversions of State banks and private bankers into the system, and the numerous organizations in the new States and Territories, where the rates of interest are so high that there is a loss, instead of a profit, on circulation; and also from the fact that many associations which have left the system on account of the restrictions of the act, have found it to their interest again to return. So long as the National banks continue to retain their reputation as the safest places of deposit, the system will attract to itself new organizations and continue to retain the old.

It is probable that, not long hence, the constitutional question will be raised whether Congress has not the power to authorize the organization of National banks without requiring them to deposit any United States bonds whatever, and in view of a recent decision of the Supreme Court, there would not seem to be much doubt as to the construction of such a law by that tribunal.

If a law should be passed authorizing the National banks to reduce the bonds now on deposit to one-half the amount now required, as given in the first proposition, the National banking system could continue during the next twenty years upon an aggregate deposit of about $50,000,000 of bonds by the different banks now organized, or which are likely to be organized, until the year 1907; and in the course of the next twenty years many strange things may happen, and among them, possibly, an increase of the National debt.

JOHN JAY KNOX.

NOTE.—Since this article was written, bills have been introduced by Senator McPherson, of New Jersey, and Hon. James F. Miller, Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, authorizing a reduction of the bonds held as security for National bank notes. The bill of Senator McPherson, like his previous bill, which was first presented in the year 1883, and which passed the Senate during the last Congress, contains a clause providing for the issue of circulating notes at the par value of the bonds, while the House bill provides for the issue of ninety per cent. only, in accordance with the present law.

Senator Aldrich, of Rhode Island, on December 18th, renewed his proposition, which was under consideration in 1883, providing for the refunding of the long

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Government bonds into 2½s, and for the payment of maturing bonds having a higher rate of interest previous to those bearing a lesser rate.

On December 13th, Hon. Abram S. Hewitt, of this city, introduced a bill in the House, authorizing the Government to anticipate the payment of interest on the bonded debt, in excess of the rate of three per cent.; for stamping the bonds which are presented so as to show the reduced rate of interest; and also authorizing such stamped bonds to be received as security for the issue of circulating notes to the National banks, at the par value thereof. The first section of this bill is as follows:

SECTION 1. That out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and empowered, to anticipate the payment of so much of the interest on the interest-bearing bonds of the United States as shall be in excess of the rate of 3 per cent. per annum, by the payment in gross of such sum in each case as shall be equal to the aggregate present worth of such excess of interest thereon. And for the purpose of ascertaining such present worth, the interest upon the amount paid by the United States in anticipation of such excess of interest shall be computed at the rate of 3 per cent. per annum reinvested quarterly, so as to secure to the United States the benefit of compound interest thereon.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GOOD WORKS OF FALSE FAITHS.

FACTS are as dangerous to handle as dynamite. They refuse to fit where they were meant to stay. They explode in the adjusting and scatter destruction. In deciding upon the quality or the origin of a religion from its permanency, or from its condition at any one time, one is especially liable to this explosion of facts.

In the spiritual, in the intellectual, as in the material world, nothing is independent, self-existent. Nothing is, but from something that was. No life exists but from antecedent life. A nation is not made full-grown, isolated. It came from another nation; it sprang from some insignificant tribe. Development is a wide if not the universal law. One human being sees but a small part of the procession of events, but the procession goes on. Birth, growth, decadence, death is the order of all systems, the history of all movements. But in death, not all dies. Out of death springs other life, waxing while the first wanes. At any point in time we do not see the evolution. We see only a cross section. Of all the rest, we must judge from that. At the present moment we see Christianity crown of the world. Other systems are on the decline, or in late stages, or inferior positions, or have perished altogether. But is the fact that they have perished or are perishable, proof that they had never a divine principle which is imperishable? May not an ethnic religion have gathered corruption and fallen into dishonor, which once was pure, if simple, and leveled society upward, placed it morally on an ascending grade? May not a preparatory religion have accomplished its object, have fulfilled its prophecies, have carried out its hints, have yielded to its successors, have become itself decadent, effete, without thereby forfeiting its claims to be in its essence a divine and preparatory religion, the harbinger of Christianity, the fore-runner of Christ?

On scriptural grounds no one can with reason maintain that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Christianity is the only religious system that has approved itself of God, or that Hebrew law was the only school-master to bring us to Christ. The Bible itself gives us an infallible rule—infallible not only by reason of its being Scripture, but because it answers to human consciousness—a general principle which touches the very depth of revelation, of natural theology, of human history. Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of Lights. So, then, not Christianity alone, but every faith that wrought good works and high character is from above.

Not heeding the ancient polities which have perished with the nations that framed them and were framed by them, we see even within the realm of written records such shining manifestations of human reason as must have come from the source of reason, the Father of Light, in whom is light, the light which is the life of men. The Romans were heathen and knew not Christ, but what virtue was wrought in them, what valor, what obedience, what self-denial, what devotion to duty, what reverence for unseen law, what administration of justice, what capacity for organization, what establishment of order! So wisely and greatly they lived and decreed, that it was finally given to Rome to give to the world a system of law which survived her empire, and deep down among the strong foundations underlies the very structure of modern society. Somewhere in the heart of their body politic must have been something divine, something whose tendency was upward, some sense of duty working itself out in right action, or the nation could not have grown so great, could not, in departing, have left upon the sands of time footprints of permanent rectitude, could not have left upon the wide-stretching ocean of life its moonglade of everlasting light.

"From my mother I learnt piety and beneficence," said a Roman heathen whose blind eyes were lifted in vain to the rosy dawn of Christianity, whose hands were imbued in the blood of its martyrs—"and abstinence not only from evil deeds, but even from evil thoughts." When he heard of the assassination of one of his rebellious subjects, he was sorry, he said, "to be deprived of the pleasure of pardoning him."

Is this but an isolated instance of heathen purity, heathen piety and forgiveness? Even so it would still be heathen purity, piety and forgiveness, a sublime and mysterious hint of Chris-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tianity, to be accounted for outside of Christianity. But the uncle and predecessor in empire of this man was as wise, as gentle, as virtuous, as beneficent as he. More than this, the nation which produced them both not only rose and ruled and fell, but it made its mark for good—and powerful and moulding good—on all the following generations. Supporting and, indeed, explaining this, it is to be remembered not only that this man bequeathed the imperishable private record of his blameless, aspiring, inward life, but as an acute Christian scholar has testified, the great record for his outward life "is the clear, consenting voice of all his contemporaries—high and low, friend and enemy, pagan and Christian—in praise of his sincerity, justice and, goodness. Long after his death his bust was to be seen in the houses of private men through the wide Roman Empire. These busts of Marcus Aurelius, in the homes of Gaul, Britain, and Italy, bore witness to their reverential memory of the passage of a great man upon the earth."

This does not mean isolated greatness, uncomprehended excellence. Those busts of Marcus Aurelius bore witness not only to the passage of a great man upon the earth, but to a wide-spread virtue, an instinct of goodness, a correct standard of judgment, a national recognition of real Divinity.

The spirit of Paul was stirred in him when he saw the city of Athens wholly given to idolatry; but even while preaching to them the new doctrine of Jesus Christ, he admitted the great truth to which their philosophy had attained: the preparatory quality in their ethnic faith. He rejected only the corruptions of this faith. The ancient faith itself he not only did not reject, but accepted as the foundation upon which to build his new structure of life and immortality, whose plan was revealed in Christ.

What its ancient faith did for Greece, what, under the ancient faith, Athens did for the world, the best conscience, the highest achievement of the world testifies. An eloquent writer, a most pure and blameless as well as a most royally endowed child of Christian civilization, testifies:

"If we consider merely the subtlety of disquisition, the force of imagination, the perfect energy and elegance of expression, which characterize the great works of Athenian genius, we must pronounce them intrinsically most valuable; but what shall we say when we reflect that from hence have sprung, directly or in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

directly, all the noblest creations of the human intellect? All the triumph of truth and genius over prejudice and power, in every country and in every age, have been the triumphs of Athens. Wherever a few great minds have made a stand against violence and fraud, in the cause of liberty and reason, there has been her spirit in the midst of them; inspiring, encouraging, consoling; by the lonely lamp of Erasmus; by the restless bed of Pascal; in the tribune of Mirabeau; in the cell of Galileo; on the scaffold of Sidney. But who shall estimate her influence on private happiness? Who say how many thousands have been made wiser, happier, and better by those pursuits in which she has taught mankind to engage. To how many the studies which took their rise from her have been wealth in poverty, liberty in bondage, health in sickness, society in solitude. Her power is indeed manifested at the bar; in the senate; in the field of battle; in the schools of philosophy. But these are not her glory. Wherever literature consoles sorrow, or assuages pain; wherever it brings gladness to eyes which fail with wakefulness and tears, and ache for the dark house and the long sleep,—there is exhibited, in its noblest form, the immortal influence of Athens."

If every good gift is from the Father of Lights, whence must Athenian philosophy have had its source?

Even to that Mohammedan state which we now chiefly associate with the stolid, the decadent, the unspeakable Turk, was there not a past worthy of other than condemnation? It is not only the poet who tells us of a

> "Something which possessed
> The darkness of the world, delight,
> Life, anguish, death, immortal love,
> Ceasing not, mingled, unrepressed,
> Apart from place, withholding time,
> But flattering the golden prime of good Haroun Alraschid."

History has told us also of the golden prime of the nation, of the time when a mighty government, grasping the sword and proclaiming the name and unity of God, went nigh to conquer the world, and to conquer it not only by the sword, but by its own order when Christendom was devoured with disorder, by its own zeal for God when Christendom was dead with unbelief—a government so majestic in its strength, so inexhaustible in its vitality, so automatic in its movement, that even to thoughtful and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Christian minds it seemed likely to overpower and outlast all Christian polities and governments.

It may be true, as Dr. Hamlin thinks, that there is none that *doeth good, no, not one,* in the Greek, Mohammedan, and heathen systems of to-day; but nothing can invalidate the testimony of the world to the benefits which it has received from the fruit of those systems in their prime. Because rankness and wrong characterize their decadence, it does not follow that they owe their origin wholly to these sources. The light that shone upon these upward ways, that guided human intelligence towards truth and beauty and love, that softened fate and glorified pain, and purified passion, and revealed wrong with its illuminating torch—was light from Heaven. It is not creditable to learning, it is not stimulating to piety, to deny it.

If the same tests were to be applied to Christianity that the professors of Christianity apply to the ethnic religions, is it certain that even Christianity would have an assured and permanent position as the one divine religion? Dr. Hamlin's convictions give us a chill doubt. He seems to imply that the Greek and Armenian churches are as proper places for missionary work, as thoroughly remote from Christianity as are the heathen temples. He includes in one hopelessness, "heathen, Moslems, nominal Christians." "Oriental apostasy from Christ" he presents as equally unproductive of progress, hope, freedom as Buddhism. But there must have been a time when the pure truth of the gospel lay in the Greek church. Theology as it left the lips of Christ was Greek theology. If in so few years the pure gospel of Christ can be hardened, neutralized, lost in nominal Christianity and oriental heresy, in arrested civilization and a warped and stunted intellectuality, why may it not be that other faiths, corrupt and deadening now, had once their moment of pure, free flow from the fountain of divine truth?

John Coleridge Pattison, the delicately-reared and carefully-educated child of a titled English family, gave his life to the upbuilding of the kingdom of heaven on those parts of the earth that were least uplifted above the kingdom of beasts. All the civilization of Greece and Rome and England he abandoned for the redemption of savages; of cannibals. A singular power of acquiring languages he considered as a Pentecostal gift of tongues, and he consecrated it to the islands of Melanesia, preaching Christ to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

twenty barbarous tribes, speaking to each in his own dialect wherein he was born. To do this it was necessary to encounter a climate so near the equator that a European was reckoned to be able to exist in it only three months of the year. To secure the confidence of his savages he threw himself greatly into their power. His wont was to row in as far as might be and then swim or wade ashore. With his own hands he taught pupils to sweep and care for their rooms ; to print and to weave nets. With his own hands he made them garments and performed all menial work, that he might thus lead them to the lowest stage of civilization and show them the nature and the dignity of work. To win their entire trust, this high-bred Englishman, the cultured and fastidious child of a nation that lugs its bath-tubs across every desert and up every mountain the round world over, chose and firmly kept the horrible solitude of close companionship with barbarism, lived among filthy and fetid cannibals, lay down at night in a long hut side by side with forty or fifty naked savages—wildest, beastliest mould of heathendom—and rose up in the morning to shape this dreadful mass into the likeness of God.

And when his work had begun to reveal itself, when he had rescued from their beastliness a group of Christian pupils, loving, lovable, intelligent, devoted to himself, and joining sympathetically in his work, what happened ? Labor-ships, ships seeking labor, and *commanded by white men*, came from afar, decoyed his humble people on board, pretending that the bishop was there, put them under the hatches, and sailed away. After that there was danger. The islanders could not always discriminate between the missionary whites and the kidnapping whites. But the greater the danger the more steadfastly the bishop persisted in landing alone, whenever it was not certain that he was well known and there was fear of attack from the alarmed and exasperated natives. Like his Master, his kingdom was not of this world, and, therefore, also like his Master, he would not let his servants fight. And so one day his dear pupils found his boat afloat in the lagoon, and in the boat lay the bishop, dead, with a smile on his face, with a palm-leaf fastened with five knots on his breast, and under the palm-leaf five wounds.

Each wound was the vengeance for a stolen friend.

Christianity is at present the crowning religion of the world, and it is carrying the good news to the new Free State on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Congo; but the same small vessel in which a Lutheran missionary sailed, carried over also one hundred thousand gallons of New England rum. The evil thus poured into it from the enlightened world threatens to overwhelm all the good which is but slowly transferred. Five years ago, liquor was unknown among tribes which are now perishing under its ruinous influence, and that liquor comes to it, not from heathendom, but from Christendom.

In the heathen nation of India, a missionary, still actively engaged in disseminating Christianity, declares that "the destructive influence of Western civilization is at present far more manifest than the renewing power of Christianity. A critical and scientific education, which trains the intelligence and not the will, has succeeded in upsetting altogether the religious faith of multitudes, and with it *many moral and social restraints*, a condition of things which, if uncared for, must bring blight and death upon the nation."

In the Parliament of Cape Town, Africa, not long ago, a bill was reported to be introduced, placing restrictions on the sale of brandy or "Cape Smoke" to the natives. But the farming legislators, most of whom are engaged in the manufacture of brandy, and all of whom are loud in their professions of Christianity, strongly objected. If the natives, they said, were really men, they were not to be treated as children. They were to be left to their own discretion as to how much they should drink. As soon as this restrictive bill was defeated, another bill was introduced giving the natives the franchise. It was at once opposed and defeated by the same members, on the ground that the natives had become sots and were not fit to be citizens.

If the religion of the heathen world is to be adjudged wholly and always corrupt, because Paul denounced the unrighteousness which he found in Rome, in Corinth, in Athens, and among the foolish Galatians, by what token shall a religion be accounted divine whose faith hardens into formula, whose children for greed will imbue their hands in the blood of its martyrs, whose professors will carry shame and degradation, ruin and death to the heathen with swifter feet than it carries to them the good tidings of great joy meant for all people? Is it for a religious system which bears life in one hand and death in the other, to cry out that all other systems had no life in them because they had the savor of death?

GAIL HAMILTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ANTHRACITE COAL POOL.

WHAT terms of condemnation are too severe for combinations to control the supply and enhance the price of the necessaries of life? Imagine that the capitalists engaged in the transportation and distribution of breadstuffs should decide that bread is too cheap. To remedy that unique evil, they combine the transportation routes of the country; gain possession of all the wheat-raising lands; cut down the wasteful and extravagant production of 400,000,000 bushels of wheat to 300,000,000; and by that means advance the price of flour from the ruinously cheap level of $4.50 and $5 per barrel to $6 and $7; enforcing upon the consumer on one hand, the lesson that he can subsist on less bread when his money will only buy three-fourths as much flour as formerly, and upon the laborer who raises the wheat, the practical demonstration that he must accept whatever wages may be allotted him. There is no doubt that such a plan might maintain an ideal prosperity for the capital engaged in it; but there is still less doubt that all the rest of the community would perceive in it a grave attack on their rights and welfare. Bread riots, insurrections, and plans for the redistribution of land which such schemes have provoked in ancient times are conceded by modern enlightenment to be blameworthy mainly for the ignorance and violence which made such protests injurious to popular welfare, rather than effective in abolishing the abuses that provoked them. Fortunately the production of food in this country is too vast, and the methods of transportation too varied, to permit a monopoly of food. Twenty years ago, we might also have thought that the laws of commerce were too well understood and the principles of justice too powerful, for the possibility of such schemes. But the success since then of projects differing from this only in the degree of their apparent impossibility, forbids us to longer rely upon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the conditions of our social system, as a guarantee against combinations to monopolize the necessaries of life.

For the question is getting itself asked in rather imperative tones: How much better is it to tamper in this way with the fuel of the people, than with their food?

Substitute anthracite coal for wheat and flour in the above imaginary case, and it is a mild summary of the combination to which Governor Pattison of Pennsylvania, and his Attorney-General, recently directed their attention. This alliance of railway interests was described by Mr. Lloyd in a former number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. It has been told that five railroad companies, engaged in transporting this fuel from the mining regions of Pennsylvania, consolidated their control by first gaining the ownership of seven-tenths of the anthracite coal lands, and finally uniting their action to restrict the total output of coal, allotting to each company a stated percentage of the arbitrary total. Mr. George's recent articles also included a graphic picture of the condition of labor in the anthracite regions under the rule of this combination.

The latest manifestations of this railway alliance induced the Governor of Pennsylvania to invoke the action of his Attorney-General, holding that such combinations are opposed to the general welfare, and violations of the Constitution of Pennsylvania, which declares that "all railroads and canals shall be public highways, and all railroad and canal companies common carriers;" that every one shall have full right to the transportation of property over them, without discriminations; and that no common carrier shall be interested "in mining or manufacturing articles for transportation over its works." This official assertion that the combination of railroads is illegal, oppressive to the individual and subversive of public policy, has elicited some not very consistent rejoinders from the gentlemen managing these corporations, some of them declaring that there is no combination but only a tacit understanding, while others acknowledge its existence but justify it as a device to keep up wages by keeping up the price of coal.

That the denial of the combination is only a *pro forma* plea in the court of public opinion, is shown by the words and acts of these gentlemen among themselves in administering its affairs. The Secretary of the combined companies writes to the officers of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Pennsylvania Railroad expressing the wish that the latter corporation "should unite in the policy of restricting the output of anthracite coal." Meetings of the managers of these companies have been held at stated periods for years, with the result of limiting the production for one month to 2,500,000 tons, for another to 2,750,000 tons, and another to 3,250,000, at the same time advancing prices in one case 35c. per ton, in another 15c., and in another, "after considering the question of advancing prices," concluding not to do so until November 1. The effect of these frequent consultations was to maintain an arbitrary restriction of production several hundred thousand tons less than was actually sold in the same months of the previous year, for the undisguised purpose, by means of that artificial scarcity, of establishing an advance of 50c. per ton, with the hope of even higher prices.

The claim that this advance in price brings an advance to the wages of the miner, is best answered by the facts. No increase has been given to the miners on account of the late advance in prices, and Mr. Lloyd's article two years ago told how the early form of this combination vetoed an advance in wages by the device of prohibitory freight rates on the shipments of the private mine owners who had granted it. The dry statistics of census and labor reports also tell a startling story of the effect of this corporate union on the labor under its control. The United States census report on "Wages and the Necessaries of Life" shows that in the first decade of the combination, the average weekly wages of the miners were reduced 36½ per cent., while the retail price of coal in Philadelphia only declined 16⅔ per cent. The Pennsylvania Bureau of Labor Statistics reports, in the early years of the present decade, that the average cost of all labor represented in a ton of coal mined and ready for shipment was $1.06 to $1.10 per ton, while the retail price in Philadelphia was maintained at $6.00 to $6.50 per ton. A table of the comparative cost of mining, published by one of these corporations in 1878, shows the reduction in the five years previous to have been nearly 60 per cent. If this were all, it would be a sufficiently severe commentary on the claim that this policy keeps up wages; but there is more behind. For the scheme of benefiting labor by restricting production issues orders by circulars that, "the anthracite coal interests have agreed upon a suspension of coal mining" on specified dates, aggregating two working weeks of a single month, and that, "it is essential that the min-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing, hoisting, preparation, and loading of coal be entirely discontinued." This method of protecting the companies from the calamity of having too much coal sent to market, has been continued for years, with the result shown in the report of one corporation, of allowing the miners to work 167.7 days in 1878; 227½ days in 1883; and, between those two extremes, a total of 1,628 days work in the past eight years. The unembellished story of these statistics beggars criticism. What more is necessary to be said regarding this device as a friend of the miners, than the cold statement of the figures that its peculiar policy has forced them to stand idle more than one-third of the time, or an average of 110 working days each year? Taking the actual average wages reported by the State Bureau of Statistics up to 1885, as affected by the enforced idleness, it shows a reduction of nearly 60 per cent. from the ante-combination period, while the fall in the price of coal was less than 20 per cent., wages having reached that level of modified starvation indicated by a weekly average of $6.67.

Add to these figures the fact gleaned from the railroad reports, that the rate of freight charged by the anthracite coal railroads has been sustained for the last sixteen years between 1¾ and 1¼ cents per ton-mile, while the fall of prices and economies of transportation have brought down the average rate on the high and low class freights carried by the trunk lines 50 per cent., to less than ¾ cent per ton-mile. The fact that this policy has maintained charges on the inexpensive coal freights at twice the average rate, and three times that on the more expensive grain traffic of the trunk lines, makes it easy to estimate the character of this combination. The meetings of the corporation magnates, their orders to restrict the production of coal, to advance prices and to stop work in the mines, show us an alliance to maintain arbitary rates for the transportation and distribution of coal; to prevent competition among themselves; and the binding feature of their device is to restrict the supply so that the markets which in a given month of one year consumed 3,300,000 tons of coal, can now be forced to pay as much for the 2,750,000 tons to which they are limited. The barrier thus erected between the miner and the consumer is for the sole benefit of the corporations and dealers transporting and distributing the coal. Against a decline of one-half in the general rate of railroad carriage, the anthracite roads maintain their old charges. Wages decline 36 per cent. in ten years and the enforced

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

idleness for one-third the working time increases that reduction to an alarming proportion. Suppose the double rate of freight charges thus maintained to extend throughout the margins secured to subordinate corporations, agents and favored dealers, and it may explain the remarkable distribution of one-sixth the price of the product for the arduous and hazardous labor of mining and five-sixths for the capital and middlemen who haul and distribute the coal to markets one or two hundred miles away. Even the failures which have occurred in the maintenance of this compact reveal its arbitrary purpose of sustaining prices. One of the pleas of avoidance and confession by which the movement of Governor Pattison was met, was that "Coal has been selling this year at seventy cents a ton less than the prices of 1884." But what is the cause of this decline? Simply that the Pennsylvania Railroad, in revenge for the invasion of its own territory by one of the anthracite roads, entered into competition with the combination. The competition was not universal. Merely a province of the coal empire was invaded. Yet the slight approach to competition reduced prices in the eastern markets seventy cents per ton, and added thirty days to the working time of the miners. But the policy of these corporations is sufficiently illustrated by the fact that, as soon as the great corporate object of preventing competition on all sides was gained, the work of restricting production and putting up prices was resumed.

What is the moral and social aspect of such a combination? Lest the attempt to properly characterize it should betray me into the use of language that might seem extravagant, I will confine myself to quoting the expressions of some eminent judges with regard to similar, or even less threatening, combinations. The Governor's appeal to the Constitution of Pennsylvania is answered by the corporations with the claim that their charters ante-date the Constitution, and are, therefore, exempt from its restrictions. But there are principles of law which existed before either their charters or the Constitution. Some of the most cogent declarations of the bench on this subject have been uttered by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. Of a similar, though less stupendous, arrangement to combine five bituminous coal companies, that Court declared: "Such a combination is more than a contract; it is an offense. In all such combinations where the purpose is injurious or unlaw-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ful, the gist of the offense is conspiracy." In the early part of the century, the eminent Judge Gibson, on the same bench, said: "I take it that a combination is criminal wherever the act has a tendency to prejudice the public or oppress individuals by subjecting them to the power of the confederates." Of a combination of salt manufacturing companies, the Supreme Court of Ohio declared its illegality when "the tendency of an agreement is to establish a monopoly and destroy competition." Long before railway combinations or anthracite coal pools were dreamed of, the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, speaking of agreements in restraint of competition, used these prophetic words: "They expose the public to all the evils of monopoly. This is especially applicable to large corporations who have the means, unless restrained by law, to exclude rivalry, monopolize business and engross the market." Not only does the common law prohibition of agreements to abolish competition apply in this case, but the very conditions on which railway charters are founded, as laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1844, and repeated in every case where a railway has secured its right of way by legal proceedings, specify that if the effect of the charter would be to establish a monopoly, not even the Legislature could grant the powers of the State for such a purpose, "as it is opposed to every constitutional principle which protects the right of property."

"But," say the railway presidents, "This is an attack upon business prosperity;" and one financial writer, in a sort of logical panic, terms it "an attack on $700,000,000 of capital." Here we reach the real foundation on which this extreme and yet typical example of the policy of combination between railways rests. "Capital must be protected against ruinous competition," is the gist of all the arguments in favor of that policy. It makes no difference to the advocates of this plea, that the capital to be protected in this case forms but a portion of the property interests of the country. Capital in general must compete for permanent investments until it reduces the current interest upon the best security to 3 per cent.; capital engaged in farming, in house-building, in merchandizing, and in manufacturing, all must accept the share of profits allotted them under the regulation of full and free competition. But the tithe of the capital of the country engaged in railway transportation claims exemption from this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regulative force and combines to secure what profits it considers just. It does not matter that the devices raise the cost of the necessaries of life to the consumer; it does not matter that the combinations are forbidden by constitutional law and denounced by the courts as conspiracies. Constitutions and economic law must be set aside to secure to this single form of capital its sacred dividends; and the astounding nature of the claim shines out of the fact that the only power by which these corporations are able to suppress competition, lies in their possession of the routes of transportation, obtained by the exercise of the most supreme act of sovereignty in their favor, upon the condition, as declared by a hundred decisions, that it is used to establish public highways.

The utter viciousness and falsity of this idea, from a purely economic view, must be laid aside to consider the far vaster and more imperative subject of its effect on our social order. For, besides the injustice, illegality, and restrictive influence upon commerce which is to be charged to it, the policy of which the anthracite coal pool is at once the climax and exemplar, shows its gravest aspect in its direct influence for the disadvantage and discontent of labor. We wonder at the frequency of denunciations against capital, and cannot understand the paradox of socialist, and even anarchist, opinions under a popular government. Yet that wonder is blind, and we are likely to fail of any understanding either of the merits or the dangers of the social problem until we perceive in such combinations as these that their most fatal effect lies in the lesson that they teach to labor. The workingman in the East finds that he must buy fuel to warm his family at such prices as capital chooses to fix in its own interest, and the miner in the coal districts must accept what wages the same power may choose to allow him. Upon the ordinary laborer the effect of this is simply to create a blind sense that he is at the mercy of capital, and is allowed just as much fuel or wages as may suffice to sustain him at his work. But the more the laborer understands of this policy the more clearly does he see that its workings are unequal, and that the inequality invariably operates to his disadvantage. The example under consideration presents to the masses the following principles as the basis of corporate action:

First—Capital, organized into great corporations, must be protected against competition for the sake of earning such profits

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as it considers proper, while the laborer is left subject to that influence.

Second—It must be permitted by this means to enhance the price of a necessary of life to the consumers on the one hand, and to crowd down the wages of the producing laborers on the other.

Third—The principles of constitutional and economic law alike, with which this policy collides, must be suspended in the interest of "business prosperity."

Such theories present business, not in the true and beneficial light of seeking under competition to perform services at the least possible cost, but in the false and oppressive light of extorting the greatest possible profits from the masses by the abolition of competition. They eliminate justice from the system of social economy and reduce that science to an absurdity. One of the gravest features of modern development is the concentration of large masses of capital in control of various industries. This tendency is justified in most cases by the ability of the concentrated capital to render the services or manufacture the products more cheaply, by reason of its strength and organization. Yet when this concentration is carried to its utmost extent, attaining the strength of hundreds of millions of dollars and the perfect organization of half a dozen great railways, we are met by the declaration that they, and they alone, will be ruined by competition. Of all forms of capital, the most thoroughly concentrated cannot endure the competition that every small farmer and retail shopkeeper in the land must meet; and the cheapness and enlarged production to be obtained by concentration resolves itself into high prices maintained by an arbitrary restriction of the supply! This phenomenal theory displays itself in the most extravagant contrast, by bringing the exemption from competition for which the greatest corporations combine, into close contact with the full competition that acts upon the hundred thousand miners who seek to earn their wages, and the ten million consumers who seek to buy their coal. The laborer finds competition working against him and not against the capital which rules the employment of his labor or the supply of his fuel. When meetings of capitalists use their control of the transportation routes to advance the price of coal to consumers at the rate of $15,000,000 a year, by the lever of enforced idleness for the miners, with a loss in wages of $10,000,000 more, is it any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wonder that labor agitators find ready listeners to the declaration that the system which permits such things is framed solely for the benefit of capital? When competition is thus made inoperative against the most powerful aggregations of wealth, and put in force against humble miners and needy consumers, can we blame those classes for regarding it as the enemy and oppressor of labor?

But the mischief is not half ended with spreading a false idea concerning the operation of a great commercial force. Next to the stupendous cruelty and selfishness of "corners" in the necessaries of life, their most vital harm is in the lesson they teach of hatred and contempt for the system of laws under which such wrongs are inflicted upon the masses. The vast body of workingmen who are brought into contact with this combination suppose that it is upheld by the law. They see its purposes carried out successfully. The price of coal is put up; its supply is restricted; and the miners stand idle one-third of their time. The property of the corporations is protected by the law, and their managers are leading members of a society in which the law is supposed to be supreme. Is it strange that the uninstructed workingman, seeing these things in his half-filled stove or his slender wages, should come to the conclusion that the law makes the incorporations of capital the masters of the people? Does it any longer seem inexplicable that the Socialist is able to make needy laborers believe that our system of government is an ally of wealth and an enemy of the poor? And if it were true that our laws gave capital the right to exact arbitrary prices from the public and to order labor to stand idle for the increase of its profits, could we say that the Socialist is wrong?

The case is better than that—and it is worse. It is better, because, as has already been shown by the declaration of the highest court of Pennsylvania, the law denounces such offenses as criminal conspiracies, and the principles of the legislation on which these corporations were given their existence carefully guards against their employment for such injurious purposes. It is worse, because the supineness of the people, the subservience of politicians, and the benumbing influence of great wealth on the administration of justice, have allowed the laws to be defied and the essential conditions on which these corporations obtained their existence to be violated and ignored. The fatuity of this policy is nowhere more apparent than in this, that it sets the ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ample of violating the laws. Such lessons "teach bloody instructions, which, being taught, return to plague the inventor." The very elements of modern society most concerned in stability and good order not only place before workingmen the example of over-riding law, but force them to imitate it. The laws of the country and the principles of trade are set aside for the sake of giving capital the sacred dividends it considers its due; and workingmen learn in this that they can ignore the same laws for the right, no less sacred to them, of sustaining their families. Corporations nullify the constitutional restrictions placed about them; and the burden of the violation bearing especially upon the laborer, it teaches him to break over his constitutional restraints, by riots and boycotts. Only a few weeks ago, a New York court enjoined the restrictive work of a musical trades union on the broad ground that combinations in restraint of trade were null and void, and in the past year trades unionists have been sent to prison for the form of conspiracy known as the boycott. At the same time this combination of capital flourishes unchecked, and only last October it was announced that the coal railroads had put a Western firm under the boycott of capital for refusing to advance the prices of coal, and would cut off its supply. With the lesson set before them by this false and destructive principle, that the laws which restrain vast aggregations of capital are null and void; that conspiracies forbidden to trades unions are practiced with impunity by combinations of railways, the natural result is to fan the discontent of workingmen into the fuel of riots, to make them support their strikes by violent attacks upon all who attempt to work against their will; to drive them to the teachings, not only of theorists who declare that relief must be sought by peaceful and Utopian Socialism, but of the inflammatory demagogues who declare that the entire system of society is an oppression, and that the rights of labor can only be secured by overturning the whole fabric into a chaos of revolution and anarchy.

Such doctrines and their provocation are alike fatally wrong. It is not true that competition is an enemy of labor. The effort of workingmen should be not so much to abolish the competition that acts upon their wages, as to summon to their relief the competition of a free demand for their work. Were there the same competition for the labor of the anthracite coal miners that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there is for the wages paid by the coal companies on the one hand, and the same competition in supplying fuel to the consumers as there is among the consumers to obtain that fuel on the other, capital would no longer command the situation. The public need, as well as the need of labor, is to invoke the aid of the law against the alliance of corporations, which, while availing itself of the competition of both miner and consumer, abolishes that principle in its own favor, and sets its united strength between a hundred thousand competitors of the former class, and ten millions of the latter. For it is no less false that our laws permit or ignore such attempts of aggregated capital to impose burdens upon the people. The fault is not in the law, but in the neglect to uphold and enforce the law. The very principles on which this government was founded furnish the complete remedy for every such threat to popular welfare. As I have endeavored to show exhaustively in another form, the constitutional conditions on which the railways obtained their existence are declared by the greatest jurists to forbid the use of even legislative power to establish exclusive privileges, or to maintain any measure of reward for capital than the only just one of competition. The remedy lies in an appeal to what Chief Justice Morton, a half century ago, called "our constitutional prohibition of monopolies," and the enforcement of the obligations of the railways as public highways. But if corporate influences stifle that appeal, and continue to set the example of lawlessness which first produced its results in the Mollie Maguire outrages among the laborers of this very combination, what will be the result? Are the excesses of the French revolution to be charged to the ignorant and desperate people who revolted from tyranny, or to the tyranny that ground them down so long that their rising could only be a frenzy of ignorance and despair? The red spectre of Nihilism is begotten by the oppression of absolutism; and if Socialism vexes this country, its paternity must be traced to the illegal privileges usurped by great combinations of capital. If combinations to enhance the price of fuel; combinations to establish monopolies in light; combinations to keep up the price of meat, and combinations to impose the burden of hundreds of millions of watered railway capital upon commerce, and through it upon labor, shall continue to concentrate the wealth of society into few hands, and set the example of contempt for law and justice, until the masses are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

incited to revolt and anarchy, will the great and powerful capitalists, or the ignorant and needy laborers, be responsible for the ruin wrought upon the magnificent promises of this country ?

Such issues as these I conceive to be involved in the effort of the Governor of Pennsylvania to bring the Constitution of the State to bear upon the combination which maintains an artificial scarcity of coal by the device of enforced idleness to labor. Other violations of the Constitution by the railways have engaged his attention ; but none of them come more directly into collision with the rights of labor than this. A slight ray of light is thrown into the gloom of the picture, by the fact that one Governor, at least, has been found to protest against the idea that if the combination of capital is great enough, it is greater than the law. But a state executive, whose term of office has already expired, could do little more than commence the effort to make the laws effective ; and the question whether the effort is to be continued must be decided by others. That decision must rest, not alone with the laboring classes, or with the rulers of the financial world, but with the whole people. Can there be any more vital and universal public duty than the prevention of Socialistic agitation and Anarchist outbreaks, by abolishing the power of corporations to control the necessaries of life, and by enforcing the laws against conspiracies of wealth, as well as against conspiracies of poverty ?

JAMES F. HUDSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME WAR MEMORANDA—JOTTED DOWN AT THE TIME.

I FIND this incident in my notes (I suppose from "chinning" in hospital with some sick or wounded soldier who knew of it):

When Kilpatrick and his forces were cut off at Brandy Station (last of September, '63, or thereabouts), and the bands struck up "Yankee Doodle" there were not cannon enough in the Southern Confederacy to keep him and them "in." It was when Meade fell back. K. had his cavalry division (perhaps 5,000 men), and the rebs, in superior force, had surrounded them. Things looked exceedingly desperate. K. had two fine bands, and ordered them up immediately; they joined and played "Yankee Doodle" with a will. It went through the men like lightning—but to inspire, not to unnerve. Every man seemed a giant. They charged like a cyclone, and cut their way out. Their loss was but 20. It was about two in the afternoon.

WASHINGTON STREET SCENES.

April 7, 1864.—WALKING DOWN PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE.—Warmish forenoon after the storm of the past few days. I see, passing up, in the broad space between the curbs, a big squad of a couple of hundred conscripts, surrounded by a strong cordon of armed guards, and others interspersed between the ranks. The government has learned caution from its experiences; there are many hundreds of "bounty jumpers," and already, as I am told, eighty thousand deserters! Next (also passing up the avenue), a cavalry company, young, but evidently well drilled and service-hardened men. Mark the upright posture in their saddles, the bronzed and bearded young faces, the easy swaying to the motions of the horses, and the carbines by their right knees; handsome and reckless, some eighty of them, riding with rapid gait, clattering along. Then the tinkling bells of passing cars, the many

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shops (some with large show-windows, some with swords, straps for the shoulders of different ranks, hat-cords with acorns, or other insignia), the military patrol marching along, with the orderly or second-lieutenant stopping different ones to examine passes—the forms, the faces, all sorts crowded together, the worn and pale, the pleased, some on their way to the railroad depot going home, the cripples, the darkeys, the long trains of government wagons, or the sad strings of ambulances conveying wounded—the many officers' horses tied in front of the drinking or oyster saloons, or held by black men or boys, or orderlies.

THE 195TH PENNSYLVANIA.

Tuesday, Aug. 1, 1865.—About 3 o'clock this afternoon (sun broiling hot) in Fifteenth street, by the Treasury building, a large and handsome regiment, 195th Pennsylvania, were marching by—as it happened, received orders just here to halt and break ranks, so that they might rest themselves awhile. I thought I never saw a finer set of men—so hardy, candid, bright American looks, all weather-beaten, and with warm clothes. Every man was home-born. My heart was much drawn toward them. They seemed very tired, red, and streaming with sweat. It is a one-year regiment, mostly from Lancaster County, Pa.; have been in Shenandoah Valley. On halting, the men unhitched their knapsacks, and sat down to rest themselves. Some lay flat on the pavement or under trees. The fine physical appearance of the whole body was remarkable. Great, very great, must be the State where such young farmers and mechanics are the practical average. I went around for half an hour and talked with several of them, sometimes squatting down with the groups.

LEFT-HAND WRITING BY SOLDIERS.

April 30, 1866.—Here is a single significant fact, from which one may judge of the character of the American soldiers in this just concluded war: A gentleman in New York City, a while since, took it into his head to collect specimens of writing from soldiers who had lost their right hands in battle, and afterwards learned to use the left. He gave public notice of his desire, and offered prizes for the best of these specimens. Pretty soon they began to come in, and by the time specified for awarding the prizes three hundred samples of such left-hand writing by maimed soldiers had arrived.

I have just been looking over some of this writing. A great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many of the specimens are written in a beautiful manner. All are good. The writing in nearly all cases slants backward instead of forward. One piece of writing, from a soldier who had lost both arms, was made by holding the pen in his mouth.

CENTRAL VIRGINIA IN '64.

Culpeper, where I am stopping, looks like a place of two or three thousand inhabitants. Must be one of the pleasantest towns in Virginia. Even now, dilapidated fences, all broken down, windows out, it has the remains of much beauty. I am standing on an eminence overlooking the town, though within its limits. To the west the long Blue Mountain range is very plain, looks quite near, though from 30 to 50 miles distant, with some gray splashes of snow yet visible. The show is varied and fascinating. I see a great eagle up there in the air sailing with poised wings, quite low. Squads of red-legged soldiers are drilling; I suppose some of the new men of the Brooklyn 14th; they march off presently with muskets on their shoulders. In another place, just below me, are some soldiers squaring off logs to build a shanty—chopping away, and the noise of the axes sounding good. I hear the bellowing, unmusical screech of the mule. I mark the thin blue smoke rising from camp fires. Just below me is a collection of hospital tents, with a yellow flag elevated on a stick, and moving languidly in the breeze. Two discharged men (I know them both) are just leaving. One is so weak he can hardly walk; the other is stronger, and carries his comrade's musket. They move slowly along the muddy road toward the depot. The scenery is full of breadth, and spread on the most generous scale (everywhere in Virginia this thought filled me). The sights, the scenes, the groups, have been varied and picturesque here beyond description, and remain so.

I heard the men return in force the other night—heard the shouting, and got up and went out to hear what was the matter. That night scene of so many hundred tramping steadily by, through the mud (some big flaring torches of pine knots), I shall never forget. I like to go to the paymaster's tent, and watch the men getting paid off. Some have furloughs, and start at once for home, sometimes amid great chaffing and blarneying. There is every day the sound of the wood-chopping axe, and the plentiful sight of negroes, crows, and mud. I note large droves and pens of cattle. The teamsters have camps of their own, and I go often

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

among them. The officers occasionally invite me to dinner or supper at headquarters. The fare is plain, but you get something good to drink, and plenty of it. Gen. Meade is absent; Sedgwick is in command.

PAYING THE 1ST U. S. C. T.

One of my war time reminiscences comprises the quiet side scene of a visit I made to the First Regiment U. S. colored troops, at their encampment, and on the occasion of their first paying off, July 11, 1863. Though there is now no difference of opinion worth mentioning, there was a powerful opposition to enlisting blacks during the earlier years of the secession war. Even then, however, they had their champions. "That the colored race," said a good authority, "is capable of military training and efficiency, is demonstrated by the testimony of numberless witnesses, and by the eagerness displayed in the raising, organizing, and drilling of African troops. Few white regiments make a better appearance on parade than the First and Second Louisiana Native Guards. The same remark is true of other colored regiments. At Milliken's Bend, at Vicksburg, at Port Hudson, on Morris Island, and wherever tested, they have exhibited determined bravery, and compelled the plaudits alike of the thoughtful and thoughtless soldiery. During the siege of Port Hudson the question was often asked those who beheld their resolute charges, how the 'niggers' behaved under fire, and without exception the answer was complimentary to them. 'O, tip-top!' 'first-rate!' 'bully!' were the usual replies." But I did not start out to argue the case—only to give my reminiscence literally, as jotted on the spot at the time.

I write this on Mason's (otherwise Analostan) island, under the fine shade trees of an old white stucco house, with big rooms; the white stucco house, originally a fine country seat (tradition says the famous Virginia Mason, author of the Fugitive Slave Law, was born here). I reached the spot from my Washington quarters by ambulance up Pennsylvania avenue, through Georgetown, across the Aqueduct bridge, and around through a cut and winding road, with rocks and many bad gullies not lacking. After reaching the Island, we get presently in the midst of the camp of the 1st Regiment U. S. C. T. The tents look clean and good; indeed, altogether, in locality especially, the pleasantest camp I have yet seen. The spot is umbrageous, high and dry, with distant sounds of the city, and the puffing steamers of the Potomac,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

up to Georgetown and back again. Birds are singing in the trees, the warmth is endurable here in this moist shade, with the fragrance and freshness. A hundred rods across is Georgetown. The river between is swelled and muddy from the late rains up country. So quiet here, yet full of vitality, all around in the far distance glimpses, as I sweep my eye, of hills, verdure-clad, and with plenteous trees; right where I sit, locust, sassafras, spice, and many other trees, a few with huge parasitic vines; just at hand the banks sloping to the river, wild with beautiful, free vegetation, superb weeds, better, in their natural growth and forms, than the best garden. Lots of luxuriant grape vines and trumpet flowers; the river flowing far down in the distance.

Now the paying is to begin. The Major (paymaster) with his clerk seat themselves at a table—the rolls are before them—the money box is opened—there are packages of five, ten, twenty-five cent pieces. Here comes the first Company (B), some 82 men, all blacks. Certes, we cannot find fault with the appearance of this crowd—negroes though they be. They are manly enough, bright enough, look as if they had the soldier-stuff in them, look hardy, patient, many of them real handsome young fellows. The paying, I say, has begun. The men are marched up in close proximity. The clerk calls off name after name, and each walks up, receives his money, and passes along out of the way. It is a real study, both to see them come close, and to see them pass away, stand counting their cash—(nearly all of this company get ten dollars and three cents each). The clerk calls George Washington. That distinguished personage steps from the ranks, in the shape of a very black man, good sized and shaped, and aged about 30, with a military moustache; he takes his "ten three," and goes off evidently well pleased. (There are about a dozen Washingtons in the company. Let us hope they will do honor to the name.) At the table, how quickly the Major handles the bills, counts without trouble, everything going on smoothly and quickly. The regiment numbers to-day about 1,000 men (including 20 officers, the only whites.)

Now another company. These get $5.36 each. The men look well. They, too, have great names; besides the Washingtons aforesaid, John Quincy Adams, Daniel Webster, Calhoun, James Madison, Alfred Tennyson, John Brown, Benj. G. Tucker, Horace Greeley, etc. The men step off aside, count their money

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with a pleased, half-puzzled look. Occasionally, but not often, there are some thoroughly African physiognomies, very black in color, large, protruding lips, low forehead, etc. But I have to say that I do not see one utterly revolting face.

Then another company, each man of this getting $10.03 also. The pay proceeds very rapidly (the calculation, roll-signing, etc., having been arranged before hand). Then some trouble. One company, by the rigid rules of official computation, gets only 23 cents each man. The company (K) is indignant, and after two or three are paid, the refusal to take the paltry sum is universal, and the company marches off to quarters unpaid.

Another company (I) gets only 70 cents. The sullen, lowering, disappointed look is general. Half refuse it in this case. Company G, in full dress, with brass scales on shoulders, looked, perhaps, as well as any of the companies—the men had an unusually alert look.

These, then, are the black troops,—or the beginning of them. Well, no one can see them, even under these circumstances—their military career in its novitiate—without feeling well pleased with them.

As we entered the island, we saw scores at a little distance, bathing, washing their clothes, etc. The officers, as far as looks go, have a fine appearance, have good faces, and the air military. Altogether it is a significant show, and brings up some "abolition" thoughts. The scene, the porch of an old Virginia slave-owner's house, the Potomac rippling near, the Capitol just down three or four miles there, seen through the pleasant blue haze of this July day.

After a couple of hours I get tired, and go off for a ramble. I write these concluding lines on a rock, under the shade of a tree on the banks of the island. It is solitary here, the birds singing, the sluggish muddy-yellow waters pouring down from the late rains of the upper Potomac, the green heights on the south side of the river before me. The single cannon from a neighboring fort has just been fired, to signal high noon. I have walked all around Analostan, enjoying its luxuriant wildness, and stopped in this solitary spot. A water snake wriggles down the bank, disturbed, into the water. The bank near by is fringed with a dense growth of shrubbery, vines, etc.

WALT WHITMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY AM I A NEW CHURCHMAN?

To the question, Why am I a New Churchman? my first and most general answer is, Because I believe in a system of religious doctrine which is to me the clear sign of a distinctly new phase of Christian faith and life—a system so broad and comprehensive, and so far in advance of the old creeds and standards, that it can be truthfully designated by no other name than that of New Church.

This doctrinal system I find in the theological writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, who bases it on the Sacred Scriptures. I make no concealment of my indebtedness to this man, or of my conviction that, under Divine Providence, he was the instrument appointed to revolutionize the religious thought of the age. But I pay him no personal homage. I do not accept his teachings on account of any claim of personal authority which may be made in his behalf. Nor does he demand any such allegiance. On the contrary, he lays it down as a fundamental principle that truth can be received by man only in the free exercise of his rational faculties, or, what is the same thing, because it is seen to be intrinsically worthy of belief. As far as is possible to a writer, he keeps himself out of view. It is a fact not generally known, that for more than twenty years after he began to write on religious subjects, his name did not appear on the title pages of his works.

The reason for my acceptance of Swedenborg's teachings, is that they shed a flood of new light on all vital questions of religion and theology; they furnish an intelligible and rational solution of every vexed problem; they make known the essential laws of spiritual life, and thus remove the ambiguities and inconsistencies which had gathered around Christian faith and worship. To state, as concisely as possible, the grounds on which this conclusion rests, will be the object of this paper.

All that is essential in religious faith is attained by man when

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he has, in the first place, a true idea of God, and, secondly, a correct understanding of the duties which he owes Him. This is a self-evident proposition. Unless these two conditions are fulfilled, there can be no mutual or reciprocal relationship between the human race and its Creator, no binding of the soul to a higher power, such as the word "religion," by its etymology, implies. Moreover, as man has no innate or intuitive knowledge of God or of the relation which he rightly bears Him, and as God alone can give this knowledge, Divine revelation is necessary as a means of imparting it. This point need not here be argued. It is sufficient to say that Christianity without the Bible would be not only impossible, but well nigh inconceivable.

If the foregoing premises are admitted, it follows that the Church, as the repository of Divine truth among men, successfully discharges its functions, just in the degree in which it is the medium of correct instruction on these vital matters. Conversely, in proportion as it is a false teacher in this regard, it fails to accomplish its mission, and all power for usefulness departs from it. Derelict is it in still greater measure if it ceases to be a guide to pure and holy living. No extraordinary discernment is, indeed, needful in order to see that an evil life and false doctrines are the natural, if not the inevitable, concomitants of each other.

Judged by this twofold standard, the Christian Church, at the time when Swedenborg lived and wrote was, as he affirms, in the last throes of its dissolution. The truth, which it first received from the lips of Saviour and Apostles, was utterly perverted, and the moral and spiritual influence which it exerted had become altogether evil. Its decline had begun with the decrees of the Nicene Council, early in the fourth century, and had thenceforth continued, slowly but surely, for more than fourteen hundred years. The Reformation had, indeed, entered its protest against the ecclesiastical abuses and pretensions of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, but it did not dispel the mists by which the essential doctrines of Christianity had been obscured; it did not bring men permanently nearer to their Lord and God. By the mouth of Luther, it emphasized faith or belief as the means of salvation; but the faith itself, already corrupted, remained practically unchanged, and the necessity of a good life according to the commandments was, to all intents and purposes, forgotten.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Swedenborg was born in 1688, and died in 1772. The son of a Lutheran Bishop of Sweden, a student at several universities, and an extensive traveler throughout all the principal countries of Europe, he had exceptional opportunities for testing the essential quality of contemporaneous Christianity. His writings contain abundant evidences of the manner in which he regarded it. But we are not dependent on his writings for a correct knowledge of its condition. History and literature alike bear witness to the prevailing corruption which came to its head in the early part of the eighteenth century. Extant and not yet discarded creeds tell the true story of the dominant belief. The idea of God was that of three Divine persons, each of them infinite, eternal, and omnipotent, who, in some mysterious manner, constitute one Deity. The first of these persons, or the Father, was supposed to be so incensed against the human race on account of Adam's disobedience, that they rested under His eternal condemnation. Divine justice required that they should live after death in a state of everlasting torment. By the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ, or the second person in the Trinity, that justice was said to be satisfied, and the punishment removed from all who have faith in Him and His atoning sacrifice. Thus it was claimed that by faith alone they were justified, and that the heathen everywhere, and all who from any cause were not converted to the true belief, remained the hapless victims of the awful penalty. Paul's declarations respecting the works of the law, in contradistinction to faith, were considered as teaching that a humble and sincere life according to the ten commandments would avail nothing towards a man's salvation, unless he distinctly believed himself a participant in the redemption effected by the blood of Christ.

Connected with this conception of God, and inseparable from it, were the most baldly literal interpretations of Scripture. It was universally believed that the whole work of creation was accomplished in six days, of twenty-four hours each, by the arbitrary decree of the Almighty. No professing Christian doubted that in the days of Noah there was a flood which submerged the whole earth, and destroyed every living thing upon it except the little handful saved in the ark. From out the sacred pages the inference was also drawn that man's corruptible body of flesh is at some future day to be raised from the dead and resume its functions. The sounding of trumpets, the visible reappearance of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Saviour, a final judgment, by which the faithful are plentifully rewarded, and the unbelievers committed to eternal flames, were eagerly awaited as the only possible fulfillment of prophecy.

This dogmatic literalness of interpretation Swedenborg condemns as a sign of the gross materialism and externalism of the age. In the prevailing doctrines with regard to God, the vicarious atonement, and justification by faith alone, he discovers proof that there was no longer any living or helpful relationship between the Church and the one true object of its worship. Let all who have any doubts in the matter candidly examine the state of things which he criticises, let them analyze the creeds which he opposes, let them read the works of Luther and Calvin, or the current theological literature of a hundred years ago; and not a few will be filled with wonder at the former things which have passed away, and will ask whether there is not a very intelligible sense in which they too are New Churchmen.

Over against the existing falsities and corruptions,—the Protestant solifidianism, the Roman Catholic assumption of spiritual dominion, and the general moral turpitude,—Swedenborg places no disjointed series of negations, but a complete new system of Christian doctrine. Of its more important features I shall presently attempt a synopsis. But before doing so, it seems necessary to touch briefly on the way in which it came to him, and on the nature of the claim which is made for it. Although, as I have said, it courts the favor of no one except on the ground of its own intrinsic reasonableness and its harmony with Scripture, it is nevertheless so intimately connected with the life and experience of its reputed author, that the one cannot be fully understood without some knowledge of the other.

Until he was more than fifty years of age, Swedenborg had written nothing on religious subjects, and apparently given them no special attention. He was principally known, in his own country, as Assessor Extraordinary of the Board of Mines, and an influential member of the Swedish Diet; and not only there, but throughout Europe, as a writer on many branches of science and philosophy. In this field he acquired great distinction; and the number and variety of topics which he treated was remarkable. Geometry and algebra, metallurgy and magnetism, anatomy, physiology, and the relation of the soul to the body were among the subjects which received his attention. There is to be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

noticed in the general order of his publications a certain gradual, but steady, progression from lower to higher themes,—from a contemplation of the mere external phenomena of nature to a study of their deep and hidden causes. He was always full of devout spiritual aspirations. In all his scientific researches he steadfastly looked through nature up to nature's God. Says one of his not too favorable contemporaries:* "He applied his whole strength in attempting to fathom the inmost recesses of things, and to connect together the various links into one universal chain, and show their derivation in a certain order from their first origin."

Maintaining this inflexible belief in God and revelation, and in the essential unity of truth, Swedenborg, in his upward course, at last reached the boundary line between matter and spirit. Then it was that he entered on those remarkable experiences by which, as he affirms, the secrets of the other world were revealed to him. He declares that the eyes of his spirit were opened, and that he had, from that time forward, conscious daily intercourse with spirits and angels. His general teaching on this subject is that the spiritual world is an inner sphere of being,—not material, and in no wise discernible to natural senses, yet none the less real and substantial,—and that it is the ever-present medium of life to man and nature. This point he illustrates by the distinction and relation between the human soul and body. These are as distinct from each other as it is possible for any two things to be; and yet, during the continuance of man's life on earth, nothing could be more evident than their mutual dependence. The soul is the man himself: the body is but the material covering which brings him into contact with the outer or natural world. By no possibility can the soul be seen by natural eyes; yet the body lives by virtue of its presence, and dies when it is withdrawn. The reason is, that the body is natural, but the soul or spirit is spiritual; the latter belongs to another and separate plane of existence. Still, it is, in itself, a completely organized form of life, having its own spiritual body within the natural one, and its own spiritual home and associations. The eyes of that body may be opened at any time, though this is not the normal or ordinary experience of men on earth. The effect of such opening is that man looks directly into the spiritual world, and has conscious

* Samuel Sandels. See Worcester's Life of Swedenborg, p. 407.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

intercourse with its inhabitants. In this way the visions of patriarchs and prophets, as recorded in the Scriptures, are to be explained. They were but temporary foregleams of the state which death makes known as a permanent reality.

To the clear perception of that inner realm Swedenborg claims to have been repeatedly admitted; and his works abound in descriptions of things there seen and heard by him. In these accounts he exhibits none of the spirit commonly ascribed to the visionary and enthusiast, nor does he present them as matters of prime importance in themselves; but with marvelous calmness and sobriety, he brings them forward as evidences of great spiritual laws, which they illustrate, and to which the attention of the reader is mainly directed. So unusual a mode of illustration is *this, that in the minds of many persons it has been permitted to* obscure, and almost to obliterate, the thing illustrated; but it is nevertheless an unquestionable fact that Swedenborg's narrations of his own personal experience occupy but an inconsiderable portion of his writings, and are manifestly subordinated to the grand doctrines respecting God's nature and Providence, Divine revelation, and the essential conditions of human happiness, which it is his chief object to inculcate as the basis of a new Christian faith.

Those doctrines, he declares, came to him out of the Holy Scriptures. "Not from any angel, but from the Lord alone, while I read the Word,"* is his very language. To help others likewise read the Word intelligently and truly, is his great aim and effort. Simultaneously with the opening of his spiritual sight, he was led to perceive, as he believes, that there is in the Scriptures a wondrous wealth of meaning previously unknown,—an internal or spiritual sense within the sense of the letter, and constituting the very soul and essence of Divine revelation. To unfold these hidden treasures of truth he regards as the chief part of his mission. As he devoutly pondered the contents of the sacred volume, they seemed to shine with a new light, and he saw clearly that, although, in outward form, they were peculiarly adapted to the times and circumstances which produced them, they had within them the living and eternal spirit of wisdom. They were composed of parables not hitherto interpreted, "dark sayings of old," which in the coming ages would be radiant with heavenly brightness. Complete possession of the key was made possi-

* True Christian Religion, No. 779.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ble to him by his intimate acquaintance with the spiritual world; for, according to his philosophy, the relation of that world to the natural is similar to that which the spirit of revealed truth bears to its letter. As every object of nature is a visible embodiment of spiritual life, so is every thought expressed in the literal sense of Scripture the outward form and analogue of some deeper and far-reaching principle. This relation between things internal and external is called correspondence. By virtue of it, whatever is outwardly seen becomes the fixed symbol and representative of something which is not seen. The phenomenal world by which man is surrounded images to his bodily sense the world of thought and affection within him. In a word, nature is the responsive and harmonious environment of mind. The Scriptures are written by means of correspondences. Their higher significance is brought forth when the symbols are interpreted.

To the exposition of this internal sense of the Bible, Swedenborg, in his theological works, devotes by far the largest number of pages. It goes without saying that those to whom the explanations seem true, must find in them not only a deep spiritual satisfaction, but a new and powerful support of faith. If heavenly lessons can be drawn from passages which appear to teach only the facts of natural science and earthly history, the strongest arguments are provided against those who would discredit Divine revelation, or detract from its authority. When, for example, it is seen that in the first chapter of Genesis no exact description of the creation of the world was intended to be given, but that the narrative, interiorly regarded, sets forth the successive processes by which man, in all ages, is *re*-created, or prepared for heaven, there is no longer any ground for affirming that the record is untrustworthy, or that God's Word is contradicted by His works. So, likewise, when the story of Adam's fall is divested of its literal improbabilities, and understood to be an allegorical account of the manner in which evil gradually gained a footing in the human heart, one favorite weapon of infidelity has lost its power. Or again, when the history of the Israelites, though resting on a basis of actual fact, is shown to portray, with the utmost minuteness of detail, the spiritual experiences of universal humanity, it rises above the limitations of time and space, and excites a proportionately broader and more vital interest.

No other claim is preferred on behalf of this interpretation of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Scripture than that it is true and reasonable in itself, and, therefore, worthy of acceptance. Closely connected with it are the doctrines comprised under the name New Church. These are presented by Swedenborg as plain deductions from Scripture,—truths which must be manifest to all who read their Bibles with open and unprejudiced minds,—truths, moreover, which Christianity, in its languishing state, needs for its own resuscitation. In what remains of this paper I shall attempt a concise statement of those doctrines, so far as relates to the two points already specified as the very essentials of religion, namely, God, and man's relationship to Him.

First, respecting God. The foundation principle in our conception of Him should be His absolute and changeless unity. Not three persons, in some miraculous manner constituting one Deity, but a being, who is one in essence and in person, should be the primary idea in our minds; and every other thought which we have concerning Him should be dominated by it.

He is Jehovah, the I am, the infinite and uncreated source of life. All other beings are but finite forms, receptive of life from Him. Not only did He create them in the beginning, but by the unceasing communication of His own life and substance He holds them in existence. Thus preservation is perpetual creation; and the universe both was, and is, created, not from nothing, but from God Himself.

He is the sum of all perfections. Love and wisdom are His very essence. Creation itself is but the exercise of infinite love acting according to unerring wisdom. This is the same as saying that the reason why men live is that the Lord loves them, or, in other words, desires objects on which His love may be bestowed, and by which it may be reciprocated. His love, of necessity, finds expression in absolute goodness, His wisdom in absolute truth. Hence He is incapable of anger, hatred, and jealousy, or of any so-called justice save that which is the outflowing of love. If the Scriptures seem to teach otherwise, we must remember that in their outward form, or the sense of the letter, they must needs be accommodated to the states of natural-minded men, and, therefore, to a certain extent, must speak according to the external appearance, rather than the internal reality.

From the recognition of God's love and wisdom, as being His essential nature, we arrive at a true conception of His Providence.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This can be naught else than the Divine oversight, or government which infinite love inspires, and infinite wisdom plans and directs. The ruling purpose which it has in view is the everlasting happiness of men, or,—what is the same thing,—the building up of a heaven of angels from them. But genuine happiness can be realized only in the exercise of freedom. Man was, therefore, created a free agent. He is not a merely passive recipient of life from God, but is endowed with the power of using that life as if it were, in every sense, his own. This freedom renders possible a reciprocal relationship between him and his Heavenly Father,—the relationship of mutual love and eternal conjunction. But it also involves possibilities of an opposite character. Liberty to do good necessarily implies the power to do evil. The constant aim of the Divine Providence is to lead us to choose good, rather than evil, because only thus can heavenly happiness be attained. God, who is goodness itself, can give birth to nothing evil. All pain and suffering are the direct, or indirect, result of man's transgressions. But though they are not caused or sent by God, they are yet wondrously overruled by Him, and made, as far as possible, the instruments of improvement and correction.

God cannot be known or apprehended by finite men, except so far as He is revealed in a manner adapted to their finite condition. In order that His divine perfections may be duly presented to their sight or thought, they must be embodied in some outward form, by which their glory is veiled, at the same time that it is manifested. Such revelations have been made from time to time, and are found recorded in the Scriptures. But the greatest among them was accomplished in the birth of Jesus Christ. That event, according to the New Church theology, was simply God's way of coming into nearer and more definite relations to His human family. No second person in the Deity made His appearance, but Jehovah Himself, clothed with the form and nature of men, became their Redeemer. Those who beheld Him saw one who was externally "a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief," but internally "the mighty God, the everlasting Father."

Thus the Lord Jesus Christ was, in very truth, Emmanuel—God with us. In Him the Divine and human natures co-existed, but not at first in perfect harmony; for the external humanity, being derived from Mary, partook of her infirmities. Hence it had tendencies to evil and was subject to temptations. But,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

though tempted in all things like as we are, Jesus was without sin. This was the Divine opportunity; for by overcoming evil in its assaults against Himself, He overcame it for men likewise, and redeemed them from the thraldom by which they were bound. His whole life on earth, rightly viewed, was a succession of conflicts with infernal spirits, in which He gained the victory.

This victorious warfare not only brought to mankind the help which it needed, but produced its permanent effect on His own human nature. That nature did not die in the sepulchre, but rose again, transformed, and glorified. Every tendency to evil, every vestige of self-hood, every trace of opposition to the perfect will of God, was gradually eliminated from it, and it was so permeated and transfigured by the indwelling spirit of the Father, that it became, itself, Divine. It was no longer the seat of two wills contending with each other; but one Divine will, one Divine consciousness, animated and controlled it. Humanity thus glorified in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ is the perfect embodiment and medium of infinite Divinity. He has, as He declares, all power in heaven and on earth. Seeing him, we see the Father. He is the one Divinely human, all-comprehensive object of our worship.

There is in Him a Trinity, but not a Trinity of persons. As every man consists of soul and body, from which proceeds his vital sphere or energy, so is it with the Lord. The essential Divine nature, which no one hath seen at any time, is within Him like a soul, and the Divine Humanity is as the body which makes it manifest, while there goes forth, through that body, from that soul, an infinite sphere of life, which vivifies and sustains creation. These three are the same as Father, Son and Holy Spirit. They are all comprehended and revealed in our Lord Jesus Christ. He not only was, but is, and evermore will be, Emmanuel, God with us.

I embrace this idea of God, because it seems to me both reasonable and scriptural. It satisfies alike my mind and heart. It is the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy and the brief summary of New Testament teaching. It removes the doubt and mystery which have always enveloped the tri-personal theory, and have made the Christian conception of the Deity practically tritheistic. It presents for my adoration one personal God, infinite and indivisible, and yet it does not take away my Saviour, or relegate Him to a secondary or subordinate position. No

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

offended majesty, no fierce anger, no stern justice demands the dread alternative of universal human suffering, or the blood of a blameless victim; but instead of this awful picture I see the perfect Love which is the fountain and the cause of being, giving itself utterly to men, coming to them visibly, borrowing their fallen nature to the end that it might be redeemed, and glorifying it with its own glory. In the Divine Humanity of Jesus Christ I behold that complete union of God with man which must ever be the connecting link between the Creator and the creation. I maintain that this doctrine, in its entirety, is new in the Church, that, nevertheless, it is the consummate flowering of the simple faith of the early Christians, which their successors perverted, and that when it is seen to be the central teaching of Divine revelation from Genesis to the Apocalypse, it opens the way for a second coming of the Lord to all who are willing to receive Him,—not a visible coming in the flesh, but a genuine spiritual presence in their hearts. It is the foremost vital truth of a new dispensation of Christianity, because it brings men into a new and living relationship with their God and Saviour.

The nature of that relationship is, of necessity, the simplest possible. No longer complicated by the idea of a plurality of Divine persons, and of faith in one of them as the means of propitiating another, it is all summed up in the words duty and obedience. The one Lord God, Father, Saviour, and Regenerator, stands before us saying, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." We prove our trust in Him whom we worship, by doing as He teaches. All other professions of allegiance are a mere pretense and mockery. The desire and effort to lead a good life are the essence of all faith. So far as they have place in any human heart, whether of Christian or Pagan, they lead on to salvation and happiness. The ten commandments are mostly in the form of prohibitions. They point out evils which must be shunned, not good acts which must be done. And here our duty to the Lord obviously begins. We must shun all evils as sins against Him,—not because they are considered disreputable and entail unpleasant consequences, but because they are sinful in His sight, and He forbids them. Acting on this principle, we shall endeavor not only to avoid the outward appearance of evil, but to put away the very desire and thought of it from our hearts. Nor need we assume to ourselves merit in so doing, or claim a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reward of virtue. All that is good in us, and all our ability to contend with evil are of, and from, the Lord. They form part of the life which He, who is Life, unceasingly communicates. As well might the moon claim credit for her reflected light, as we for ours. Nor ought we to think of heaven as a reward arbitrarily bestowed at the end of earthly existence. It is, in its essence, a state of mind and heart. "Behold," says our Lord, "the kingdom of God is within you." That kingdom is the government of Divine truth and goodness in our souls. Its happiness consists in the delight which flows from conformity to the laws of Divine order, or, what is the same thing, from the active exercise of love to God and man. So far as any one is in that delight, he is in heaven. Though this world may be his visible place of habitation, he is interiorly in the company of angels, and after the death of the body lives openly and consciously among them. Those, on the other hand, whose ruling love is love of self or the world, are in the exactly opposite condition. Their happiness consists, not in doing good to others and making them happy, but in selfish and sensual indulgences. To live in heaven would be no joy to them, but rather torment. Heaven is not in their hearts; they spurn and reject it in their lives. Their state is described by the word hell. It is the state from which all are mercifully delivered, who, according to their knowledge and ability, give heed to the Divine admonitions. It is the state in which all eternally remain who refuse to submit themselves to the Divine guidance.

These, then, are the fundamental principles of the new Christianity, which I, albeit feebly and unworthily, espouse: *First*, one God,—Father, Son and Holy Spirit,—Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier,—made known in all His fullness, as the Lord Jesus Christ; *secondly*, accountability to Him, as a living personal presence, in whose eyes all evil is sin, and who is the source of all goodness; and, *thirdly*, the Sacred Scriptures, laid open as to their interior spiritual contents, and shown to be a book of infinite wisdom, the eternal expression of God's truth to men. Many important, yet minor, doctrines are involved in these; but these are the three essentials to which all the others are tributary.

It remains simply to be said, that when I speak of the New Church, I do not refer to any mere organization of professed believers who call themselves by that name. To such an organiza-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion I belong, and it supplies for me a want which cannot be met elsewhere. But the term New Church, in the broader sense in which Swedenborg teaches us to use it, is a new phase of religious thought and life, receiving its impulse from on high, and making itself felt throughout the world. Few intelligent men of to-day are too blind to see that the wondrous changes amid which we live are having their marked effect on Christianity itself. The old dogmas of a hundred years ago are, as it were, melting away in the warmth of a new and milder atmosphere. The sons discard, sometimes quite unconsciously, the cherished opinions of their fathers. Not only the beliefs, but the asperities, of former generations are disappearing. And still the change goes on. In the middle of the last century these things were all foretold by the calm Swedish philosopher, who subscribed himself "Servant of the Lord Jesus Christ," as he expounded the deeper meaning of Scripture, and recorded his marvelous visions, in the devout belief that he was commissioned to proclaim the truths of a new dispensation. Certain it is that the trend of modern Christian thought, so far as it has deviated from the old standards, and still maintains its Christian character, has been in the direction which he indicated. A strange observer of the times must that man be, who imagines that the end of this new movement has yet been reached. Rather should we say that it has hardly begun. Fortunately, the ordering of events is not in our hands. The holy city, New Jerusalem, type of the church that is to be, is not built up by men upon the earth, but comes down from God out of heaven. It comes not with observation, but it surely comes; and everywhere around us are the signs of its coming.

JAMES REED.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHASE AND THE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.

THE article, by Colonel Donn Piatt, in the December NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW brought out quite a number of reminiscences and letters of especial interest as matters of history. No man occupied a more prominent position, or wielded a wider influence during the troubled times that preceded and followed the late civil war. As a financier, Chief Justice Chase, then at the head of the treasury, won for himself imperishable renown during the armed conflict. This is well known, but the fact that he was the author of the constitutional provisions and much of the legislation that followed, is not so well known. This is made prominent in the letter we are permitted to give the public.

It will be observed in a study of this important document, that the amendments suggested by the Chief Justice, and subsequently adopted in the main, are without the harsh features afterwards incorporated that led to such bitterness, that the political war over reconstruction was as bitter as the armed war of secession.

Chief Justice Chase always held the intellect of the governing element of the South in high respect, even when fighting it as an abolitionist. Its courage won also his admiration when it took the field to fight for its independence. He believed in the generosity of the conqueror, and sought to have our defeated brothers brought back to their home as gently as possible.

This confidential letter, written in the greatest frankness by one friend to another, also throws light on what heretofore has been considered a mystery, and that is how it came that President Lincoln called Mr. Chase to the high position of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. It is well known that the political and personal relations of these eminent men were far from friendly. The Secretary of the Treasury had been openly in the field as candidate for the Presidency against his chief, and candidate of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Democratic party. The popular belief is that President Lincoln did this to put out of the way a formidable rival. A study of dates sets aside this supposition, so injurious to the memory of the President.

The author of the article on Salmon P. Chase, observing the reference to Justice Field being the first to suggest the appointment of Chief Justice, sought the eminent jurist and leading member of an illustrious family, and asked him "What it meant."

"I will tell you with the greatest pleasure," responded the Justice. "In the last year of Chief Justice Taney's life he was taken very ill, and we all believed his end to be near. Of course, no reference was made by me or any other member of the Supreme Bench to the succession until we learned that the late David Davis, of Illinois, who had great influence with Mr. Lincoln, had organized a party in behalf of the late Justice Swain. Now, while we had the greatest respect for Swain, we knew that he was not the man for a position that events had made, and were making, of such vital importance to the nation. I consulted my associate, Justice Miller, and we both selected Chase as the man of all men fitted for the place. Miller, indeed we both had our doubts as to Mr. Chase's acceptance, and I volunteered to ascertain.

"That day while walking along Pennsylvania avenue toward Willard's Hotel I met Mr. Chase, and, after the ordinary salutation, I asked him how he would like to be Chief Justice. He seemed startled and then, turning round, walked with me. He seemed to have a difficulty in getting hold of the proposition. At last he said, 'have you consulted Sumner?' I replied 'no, but I will immediately.'

"Sumner at that time lived on the corner of H and Vermont avenue. I found him at his desk, almost buried in papers, writing vigorously. I at once told my business, and, without a word of discussion, he rose saying, 'I will see the President,' and left the house.

"Chief Justice Taney recovered from his severe sickness, and the subject, of course, was dropped. As the end of our term closed, I called to pay my respects. I found him exceedingly feeble, so much so that when I gave him my photograph, which he had requested, I noticed that his sight had failed him, and I was pained

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the thought that I was looking upon his memorable form for the last time. I knew that before I could return from California another Chief Justice would be numbered with the dead. I went from his house to the Executive Mansion to say good-bye to the President. I found him pressed with affairs, but on my saying 'Mr. President, I am going to California, but before I return for the next term of court you will have to appoint a new Chief Justice,' he looked at me with an inquiring expression peculiar to him, and asked me if I could not remain a day longer. I responded, certainly. The next day he told me that, in case of a vacancy, he had made up his mind to appoint Chase, and asked me if I thought Chase would accept. I then told him what had occurred. 'That is all,' said the President, and then added 'I wonder how Katie will like it?'"

In this way the eminent man was called to his true vocation. That question with which the story ends has its significance. It was well known that one of the most potent factors in the formation of the Chase party was in the winning grace and subtle tact of his accomplished daughter. Now, while President Lincoln was more amused than offended at this, his wife became furious, and kept up a war of a social sort that was far more disagreeable than effective.

Here, however, is the letter:

II.

WASHINGTON, *April* 30, 1866.

MY DEAR JUDGE: It grieved me much to hear from your brother, Mr. Cyrus W. Field, that you have been quite ill. I supposed that you were now in or very near California. You must take the best care of yourself, not only for the sake of your family but of your country, which now needs true patriotism as well as legal learning upon the bench. I feel all the interest of a warm personal friendship in your welfare. It is not in my nature to forget friends even when serious differences of judgment and political affinities come in to make separation; and no such differences come between us. Do you remember when, just before the end of the term in the spring of 1864, you met me on the avenue, and expressed your warm wish that I might fill the place I now occupy? If you have forgotten it, I have not, nor shall I ever

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forget it. It took me by surprise, but was very grateful to my feelings.

What do you think of the plan of reconstruction, or rather of completing reconstruction, presented by the Committee of Fifteen? To me it seems all very well, provided it can be carried; but I am afraid it is, as people say, rather too big a contract. So far as I have had opportunity of conversing with Senators and Representatives, I have recommended to confine constitutional amendments to two points: (1.) No payment of rebel debt and no payment for slaves; (2.) No representation beyond the constitutional basis. And, as so many are trying their heads at form, I drew up these two amendments according to my ideas, as follows:

ARTICLE 14.—*Section* 1. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers; but wherever in any State the elective franchise shall be denied to any of its inhabitants, being male citizens of the United States, and above the age of twenty-one years, for any cause except insurrection or rebellion against the United States, the basis of representation in such State shall be reduced, in the proportion which the number of male citizens so excluded shall bear to the whole number of male citizens over twenty-one years of age.

Section 2. No payment shall ever be made by the United States for or on account of any debt contracted or incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States; or for or on account of the emancipation of slaves.

And I proposed further that the submission of this article to the States should be accompanied by a concurrent resolution to this effect:

"That whenever any of the States which are declared to be in insurrection and rebellion by the proclamation of the President of the United States, dated July 1st, 1862, shall have ratified the foregoing article, Senators and Representatives from such ratifying State or States, ought to be admitted to seats in the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, in the like manner as for States never declared to be in insurrection; and that, whenever the said article shall have been ratified by three-quarters of the several States, Senators and Representatives ought in like manner to be admitted from all the States."

It has really seemed to me that on this basis the completion of reorganization by the admission of members in both Houses of Congress would be safe; and I have greatly doubted the expediency of going beyond this. In two other important respects the report of the committee does go beyond this: (1) Prohibiting the States from interfering with the rights of citizens; (2) Disfranchising all persons voluntarily engaged in rebellion until 1870, and (3) In granting express legislative power to Congress to enforce all the new constitutional provisions. Will not these

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

propositions be received with some alarm by those who, though opponents of secession or nullification, yet regard the real rights of the States as essential to proper working of our complex system? I do not myself think that any of the proposed amendments will be likely to have injurious effects, unless it be the sweep of the disfranchisement; but I repeat, that I fear the recommendation of too much; and, I add, that it seems to me that nothing is gained sufficiently important and sustainable by legislation to warrant our friends in overloading the ship with amendment freight.

But this letter is too long. Pardon and answer. Have you read the opinion and the dissent in the Bank case?

Yours cordially,

S. P. CHASE.

I inclose an opinion in an Admiralty case, which I think right. The question is of importance, especially in California and on the Pacific Coast.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT SHALL BE DONE WITH THE SURPLUS?

THIRTY millions a month goes into the Treasury by the force of existing laws. Not more than twenty millions a month can be paid out, without violation of existing laws, except for the redemption of bonds. At that rate the last of the bonds that can be called until 1891 will be paid off next July. Then what can be done with the surplus of $10,000,000 per month? Without stealing, it cannot be got out of the Treasury, unless the laws be changed. Without ruin, it cannot be kept in the Treasury.

Not many governments have ever been in trouble because they were too rich. Twenty years ago, when the net debt was more than twice what it is now, there were few who imagined that, within the life-time of any then active in affairs, the United States government would be embarrassed by riches. Two years after the war had ceased, the Treasury sold six per cent. bonds at a premium of only a quarter's interest; now it cannot buy a four per cent. bond without paying a premium equal to seven years' interest. Now, prostration of industry impends, through absorption of the currency into a plethoric treasury. In 1887, if there comes no change of the laws, the life-blood of trade must be drained into the Treasury at the rate of $120,000,000 yearly.

Micawber was not, perhaps, a model financier, but he knew that a surplus could not be made less by putting out a new promise to pay instead of an old. It is, therefore, a curious mistake when Secretary Manning proposes "payment of $346,681,016 outstanding promissory notes of the United States with the present and accruing treasury surplus, issuing silver certificates in their room, without contraction of the present circulating volume of the currency." If the certificate is a title deed to the silver in the Treasury, the greenback is equally a title deed to the gold. It is possible to cancel greenbacks with the surplus revenue, but that is contraction of the currency. It is also possible to offer silver

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

certificates in exchange for greenbacks, but that is not using or diminishing the surplus. The sum of notes to be paid after the exchange would be no less than before, and the sum of cash accumulated for their payment just the same. How it would help the public credit or the country to put out promises to pay seventy-five cent dollars instead of promises to pay one hundred cent dollars, need not here be asked. Nor will Congress vote to lend the money to bondholders, as Senator Beck proposes. It will rightly say that the bondholders need it less than anybody else, and can borrow now on governments more than the Treasury ought to lend.

There are two ways, and but two, of dealing with the surplus. Income can be reduced, or expenditures can be increased. Apoplexy can be cured by sending less blood to the base of the brain. It can be cured by drawing off the excess. But it cannot be cured by calling the crowding and mounting blood by a different name. It must be confessed that the great statesmen of the day do not shine with especial effulgence in their treatment of this problem. One class would cut down or cut off taxes on articles of voluntary use, on luxuries and on sugar; another would cut down or cut off duties on articles which compete with important products of home industry; but neither stops to ask whether the remission of taxes would do as much good as a wise use of the money raised. The veteran Morrill would like to untax the sugar bowl and the pipe. Is he quite sure that more education would be less useful than more pipes? Mr. Randall, with "a tariff only for revenue" as his slogan, would encourage whiskey drinking rather than industrial schools. Mr. Morrison urges that a surplus revenue makes it necessary to invite larger importations and raise a larger revenue, by reducing protective duties.

The talk of cutting down protective duties, as a remedy for the threatened surplus, is worse than child's play. Not a man of those who urge this remedy would dare to vote for a bill to so change these duties that they should yield even $50,000,000 less to the Treasury than they do now. The revenue duties on sugars, fruits, tobacco, liquors, jewelry, furs, kid gloves, fancy articles, embroideries and laces, velvets, silk cloths, and hosiery, yielded last year $91,400,000, and all other duties, mainly, but not wholly, protective in character, yielded $98,000,000. A proportionate reduction of ten or twenty per cent. in duties of the latter class

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would increase the revenue, which would be folly. A still larger reduction would increase it more. But in time the enlarging hole in the dam brings ruin. Presently the rising flood of foreign goods would prostrate home industries, and take from the people the ability to consume foreign products. That point would come before half the present duties had been removed, and then, in national ruin and bankruptcy, a material decrease of revenue would come, and not otherwise. Political leaders know this. The proof is that not one of them dares to propose a reduction averaging as much as a third of the protective duties now levied. Even Mr. Morrison does not, though, surpassing the tailless fox, he tries to make it the fashion to get amputated at the other end. He would hardly venture to vote for his own feeble bill of last year, knowing what he now knows, if he were not beaten already.

A statesman should ask, first, whether the revenue ought to be reduced at all. This country has been nearly talked to death by tax-reducers and money-savers. For twenty years it has been taught that a traitor is a much better man than one who votes to spend a public dollar that could possibly be saved. In private life, a more despicable creature than the miser is not known to Americans. But in public life, a man who is too stingy to succor sorrow or relieve want, even when a soldier's widow lifts wan hands to the government he tried to save, a man too mean to care whether his nation is disgraced, a man too stupid to see that education is the best crop that can be grown on free soil, a man too cowardly to invest a dollar lest it should be lost, is called a great statesman and a "watch-dog of the Treasury." Like master, like man; the voters in some districts seem incapable of comprehending why the contemptible creature who hid his talent in a napkin was cast into outer darkness. There are many uses that can be made of public money, better than to give it back to smokers and drinkers, to German importers or British manufacturers. The duty of government, as of the servant who had the one talent, is to make the best use of what it has. To hand it over to foreigners as an inducement to break down American industry, to give it to importing agents as a reward for cheating government by undervaluations, to encourage more smoking and drinking in a country which smokes and drinks more than enough already, is possibly not the very worst use that could be made of the money, but it is not far from it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What would the surplus be worth to the people, if left in their hands? Part of it would not be left to them; it is paid by foreign manufacturers and importers for the privilege of selling here. Another part the people would transmute into smoke by increased consumption of tobacco, or into headaches, diseases, and crimes, by a larger consumption of liquors. But if every dollar of the surplus could be left to the people, what would it be worth? Railroad capital averages about four per cent. The still larger capital invested in farms does not return four per cent. to owners. The increase in all wealth, from 1870 to 1880, was about 3½ per cent. yearly. The man who keeps money at 3½ per cent., when he can place it more safely at a higher rate, is not as sane as most Americans. What shall be said of the sanity, then, of those who insist that the people would be better off to keep their money at 3½ per cent., than to have it invested by the Government in the industrial education of the young? Is there a member of Congress who does not know that money so invested would return a far greater profit than that to the people, whose faithful agent he has sworn to be?

No one doubts that the common school system, inadequate, ill-directed, and one-sided as it often is, and tending far too much to beget a distaste and unfitness for the labor of productive industry, nevertheless returns to the people in value of labor many times its cost. It is the common school system that has lighted the fires of thought and ambition in millions of minds. Consider the patents issued, 93,000 in five years, and their incalculable value to American industry; consider how they make American labor more effective than that of any other country; consider how single patents have been worth more than a year's schooling for the whole nation. This is but one of many harvests from that sowing. The country now pays for the schools about $100,000,000 yearly, and the average cost, $15.50 yearly per scholar, is returned many fold in the increased value of American youths as workers. Must not the return be far greater if, with the years of "book learning," every scholar were taught the rudiments of useful trades and employments? Would practical training for industry cost too much? Perhaps it would double the cost of the school system, but that would only use up the surplus about which statesmen are anxious.

How many misdirected lives there are; how many aimless

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wanderers, who have lost their way. How many have been thrust into work for which they are unfit, doomed to a life-long barren endeavor to make a shovel do the work of a mason's trowel. No one can compute the waste of power and loss of opportunity which come from mistaken choice of work, by boys who have no chance to find out what they can do best, or by parents who know only the trades by which they live, or by prejudices, circumstances, or accidents. Industrial training would pay back all its cost by giving each boy a chance to find out what faculties he has, and for what work he is best qualified. A larger consideration is that the schools now send too many boys into trading, teaching, the professions, or "living by their wits." Industrial training would win a larger share to productive labor, show how to put brains into it, and make it more honorable.

Only a minimum estimate of the value of such training is possible. Many a workman remembers how he had to pick up his own knowledge of his craft, scantily paid or not paid at all, taught by nobody, set to do the rudest work because there was no time to fit him for any better, and kept at the rudest work and the lowest pay until by violence, so to speak, he broke through the wall of opportunity and mastered the methods of better work. He can best judge what it would have been worth to him, had he been taught at school, with patience, example, and stimulating rivalry, more than a year of ill-paid labor gave him scanty opportunity to pick up for himself. But others know what a green boy is worth at the bench, in the workshop, or on the farm. What would he be worth if he had learned at school to use the tools and to comprehend the processes of his occupation? The boy who begins to learn a carpenter's trade, for instance, may hope to add each year about 50 cents to his daily wages; after about five years' work, he may come to be worth a man's full pay. Industrial training would at least make him worth as much in the first year as he now is in the second, and so would add for each of five years more than $100 to the value of his labor. At that rate, each year's crop of 1,200,000 boys and girls would more than repay the year's surplus, if it were entirely expended in industrial education, by their first year's gain, and would leave a similar gain for each of four succeeding years as clear profit on the investment.

"But that reckoning includes the girls." Why not? France

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

supports an industrious and thrifty people, so far content that it sends fewer immigrants than any other great nation to these or other shores, on about fifteen cents per day for food.

The cost to people of this country is fully thirty cents per day. Our people are blest with more liberal supplies, but at lower cost. Certainly a third of the difference, or five cents per day for every inhabitant, is due to household waste and ignorance in cooking. When American girls are taught to cook as carefully and as intelligently as they are taught to spell and cipher, they can save the workingmen of the next generation, whose wives they are to be, and true helpmeets they ought to be, at least five cents a day for every person. For 60,000,000 people, that is $1,095,000,000 yearly. The industrial education of one sex alone in sewing and household arts and economies would return yearly, in profits to the people, the cost of ten years' training for both sexes, more than the entire surplus, which threatens, if unemployed, to bleed industry to death. Why does not the hard-worked mother teach her daughter? Ask her. "What time or what means have I here to teach anything? How can I teach them what I do not know myself? Mother was the slave of the factory, as I am the slave of the kitchen. It may be true that half the food we buy, if cooked as it ought to be, would do more good; but who is to teach me what to buy or how to cook? I would bless God if He would give my girl the chance I never had." Education there is, but it begins at the wrong end. Less of the nation's welfare depends upon good spelling than upon good cooking. An empty stomach is rarely near heaven, and good wages have a more civilizing influence than good grammar.

Every dollar of the surplus should be invested in providing industrial training, free to all children, in addition to the public school system. Whether the expenditure should be controlled by the General Government, or by State or local boards, need not here be discussed. If the working people of this nation come to understand what this opportunity means for them and their children, they will find a way to embrace it, and make it hot for any party which pretends to find constitutional or practical barriers in the way. What are the Knights of Labor doing? This measure would be worth more to industry than all the labor organizations that ever flitted, ghost-like, through the dreams of an agitator or walking delegate. What are capitalists doing? This measure

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would enhance the value of American labor, and would kill free trade agitation at the same time. Socialism, is it? The common school system is only a blinder and less profitable socialism. The water-works and public parks, the libraries and humane institutions, are works of pure socialism, and he who does not know it does not comprehend the meaning of words. Has this nation a genuine belief in Him who said, "Sell that thou hast and give to the poor, and follow thou me?" Can the Christian of the nineteenth century give to the poor in any way more wisely than by educating and training them, so that, by honest industry, they may become less poor? Can the Christian of the nineteenth century vote to put certain millions into importers' pockets, or into the pipe, the coffee cup or the beer or whiskey glass, and not into the uplifting of the children of American fishermen and carpenters?

W. M. GROSVENOR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOR IN PENNSYLVANIA.

IV.

ECONOMICALLY, Pennsylvania is a most interesting State, and would well repay a comprehensive examination of the conditions of labor in its varied industries. For this, however, I cannot now spare time. In three preceding papers, I have given some idea of the conditions of labor in the largest of the industries for which Pennsylvania is noted—that of coal mining. From this the conditions of labor generally may be inferred, and the futility of that policy of "protection to labor" for which Pennsylvania has been so clamorous may be readily seen. The condition of the coal miners in the much protected State of Pennsylvania is bad enough. Yet, bad as it is, it is evident that it would be worse, but for the miners' associations, backed by strikes or the fear of strikes. Whomsoever the tariff may protect, it does not protect the coal miners.

As for iron mining, another petted industry of Pennsylvania, the protection of which, directly and indirectly, imposes the most enormous burden upon the industries of the whole country, wages are in that even below those of coal mining, for the reason that there is less combination among the miners. In Lehigh, in Northampton, and in Berks, according to the reports made by employers to the Bureau of Industrial Statistics, iron miners are working for 70 cents a day, and engineers for 80 and 90 cents. In other counties the rate rises to 75 cents, 80 cents, 90 cents, and $1.00 per day for miners, and correspondingly for engineers. But these wages, it must always be remembered, do not secure steady work. Of the returns I have noted, the highest number of days worked in the year is 265—a case in which 70 cents per day was paid miners. In another case, in which miners' wages are placed at 70 cents, the number of days worked is 190. Carnegie Brothers & Co., who have been "protected" into enormous fortunes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the tariff, and who are really generous men, pay their miners $1.10 to $1.15 per day. But should "Triumphant Democracy" point to this with pride, it should add that, in the year for which these returns are given, the Carnegie miners had only 119 days work. The highest wages paid in iron mining appear to be in the Cornwall mine, in Lebanon County, where miners get $1.40 per day. These exceptional high wages seem to be attributable to the liberality of the managing owner.

This Cornwall iron mine is worth a passing notice. It is in Lebanon County, a few miles from the city of that name, and is the richest deposit of iron ore yet known in the world, with the possible exception of one in Mexico. It is not a mine in the common understanding of the word, but rather a quarry. Three great hills of very nearly pure magnetic iron rise from the plain, and all that has to be done is to dig it out and carry it away. Since 1740, and up to the 1st of January of this year, it is estimated that something like 7,500,000 tons have been taken out; but thirty or forty million tons are estimated to yet remain above water-level, and below that borings have shown the deposit to reach to a depth of at least 300 feet.

This great store of the richest iron ore is believed by most of the people of those parts—for old ideas yet prevail about Lebanon—to have been made by God. But in some way that they do not readily explain, it seems to be held that the right to dispose of it for all future time inhered, about 1680, in one James Stuart, since dead, who was awhile King of England, and then retired into France. This James Stuart, from whom, although he is now nearly two centuries dead, all rights to the use of this part of the world are still supposed to come, made a grant of a considerable part of the planet he was so soon to leave to John, Thomas, and William Penn, their heirs or assigns, forever. Of this piece of the planet the Penns assigned some ten thousand acres of the surface, with all that lay below the surface, to one Joseph Turner, by whom it was in turn assigned, in 1732, to a William Alden. In 1737 this Alden, in consideration of £135 (probably depreciated currency), to him in hand paid, assigned the right to the exclusive and perpetual use and enjoyment of three hundred acres, containing the iron hills, to one Peter Grubb.

Between 1786 and 1789 one Robert Coleman bought various interests from the heirs of Grubb, until he had secured five-sixths,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leaving to one of the Grubbs a one-sixth interest. These interests have descended through the Grubb and Coleman families until, at the present time, there are four Colemans, two male and two female, who own fifteen ninety-sixths each, and a Coleman or two and several Grubbs who own the rest in smaller interests. The value of the deposit may be inferred from the fact that the reservation made by one of the original Grubbs, in his sale to the first Coleman, of the perpetual right to enough ore to keep one furnace going, and which now attaches to the Robesonia furnace, sold, some years since, for $700,000, being bought in by the Colemans. The ore is now taken out under one management, by the use of air-drills and dynamite, and the proceeds are divided between the various interests. One of the two male Colemans lives in Paris, where he prefers to enjoy the enormous income which comes to him, without work on his part, by virtue of the grant of James II. The other, Robert H. Coleman, a young man of enterprise and liberality, lives at Lebanon, and is the manager of the estate. In all but the title, he is an American nobleman of the best English type. His interest in the iron deposit, rich as it is, is only a part of his estate. He has some 20,000 acres of the finest Pennsylvania limestone land, kept in the best cultivation, under competent superintendents, and stocked with the very finest of choice cattle; a railroad or two which connect with the Pennsylvania and Reading systems, a splendid mansion, and nobody knows what else besides. On the day of his majority, besides the real and other personal property, his guardian turned over to him $1,200,000. In the neighborhood of Lebanon, the Colemans are believed to be the richest family in the country, the Vanderbilts and Astors not excepted. Young Robert builds churches in Lebanon and Cornwall, makes good turnpikes of the slack out of his furnaces; plants them with shade trees; has given largely to the college in which he was educated; is kindly and liberal to his tenants and employés; entertains societies when they visit Lebanon, and seems to be, in short, the kind of a young prince that would delight the heart of a Tennyson—a genial, upright, and free-handed lord of land and master of men, who takes the world as he finds it, but doubtless often wonders in his heart at the superstitious reverence for James II., which renders this wonderful iron quarry, and so much of the fair land about it, as fully the private property of the Colemans and Grubbs as though *they* made it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But all this aside, what, in the face of such a deposit of ore as this, becomes of the contention that a heavy duty on iron and iron ore is necessary to prevent the suppression of the Pennsylvania iron industry by the competition of the pauper-made iron of Europe? The Cornwall deposit was worked for years and years before we had any duty upon iron and iron ore. It could not, of course, be worked if the Colemans and Grubbs chose to shut it up, as the eccentric proprietor of an iron mine near Edinburgh chose to do with his mine some years since, answering all remonstrance as to the destruction of a considerable industry, and the starving out of a considerable population, with the laconic observation that the ore in the ground might stay there, since it would "no eat anything." But with the permission of the Colemans and Grubbs, this rich iron deposit could be worked, not only if there were no duty on iron, but if the "pauper" iron ore producers of Europe would work for nothing and pay their own board. It came out in legal proceedings, taken in about 1859, to determine whether the right reserved to as much ore as would feed one furnace, applied only to such a furnace as was in use in the last century, or to a modern furnace, that the cost of mining ore in Cornwall was only 16 cents per ton, which, to say nothing of the superior quality of the ore, is much less than the transportation of European pauper ore would cost. It is not probable that a single additional ton of iron ore has been mined at Cornwall because of our tariff. If the tariff has had any effect it has simply been to increase the profits of the Cornwall owners, and not in the slightest degree to add to the wages which they must pay their men. If, as a matter of fact, they do pay more than current wages, it is because of their own liberality. Mr. G. W. Childs also pays more than current wages, but his business is unprotected by the tariff.

So, too, it is with the duty on coal. This duty is a grievous burden upon the industries of California, the Gulf States, and some parts of New England, and gives protection to the monopolies which largely neutralize the natural advantages of Philadelphia as a manufacturing city by compelling her people to pay a considerably higher price for coal than the same coal is sold for shipment at the Philadelphia wharves. But its benefits, such as there are, certainly do not go either to the miners or to their immediate employers, the coal operators. If any one at all is benefited, it is the owners of coal land and the monopolists of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

transportation. The competition which would force the wages of miners down to a point that would give them only a bare subsistence is only held in check by miners' combinations and strikes—bitter struggles of endurance, not always entirely bloodless, which entail almost as much loss and suffering as actual warfare, and which, under the pressure of necessity, are fought with such tenacity that I find in the recent number of the *Coal Trade Journal* a statement, made as a cool matter of business information, that at the conclusion of a recent strike, near Reynoldsville, the miners were in such a reduced condition, physically, for want of proper food, that they could not perform a day's work for some time. No matter what the profits of coal mining may be, it is evident that, under what we call the free competition of labor and capital, they cannot, for any length of time, go either to miners or to operators, but must at length be taken up in the royalties paid for the privilege of mining coal and in the increased values of coal lands. The royalty now paid in the anthracite district ranges from 40 to 60 cents per ton, and will probably average 50 cents, and where mines are worked by the owners, as is the case with the mines owned by the great railroad companies, the royalty, whatever it may be, goes, of course, to the credit of the capital invested in the purchase of the mines; so that the effect of the duty, whatever it may be, is not to benefit the miner or the operator, who is his immediate employer, but merely to increase the charge which the owner of coal land can make for the use of the natural agent of production—the coal imbedded in the soil by the slow processes of nature, ages and ages before men came upon the earth, and which would exist with all its usefulness unimpaired whether the owner could get any royalty or not, or whether there was any individual owner or not.

These principles, clear enough in regard to the mining industries of Pennsylvania, apply to all her other industries. The plausible pretension that the somewhat higher rate of wages in this country than in Europe necessitates the building of a tariff wall around our coasts, and along the imaginary line which separates us from Canada and Mexico, is utterly negatived by the difference of wages which exists in Pennsylvania. The Cambria Iron Company at Johnstown—great sticklers, by the bye, in Washington lobbies and before Congressional Committees for the "protection of American labor"—having crushed out the Labor Associations,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pay wages some 20 per cent. less than are paid in Pittsburgh. There is quite as great a difference between the wages paid in glassmaking in the Eastern and in the Western part of the State. Cigarmakers in Reading get two or three dollars less per thousand than cigarmakers in Philadelphia and New York, and so it is with other industries. If a difference in wages necessitates the putting up of a tariff, then, instead of being in common with the rest of the country shut in by one tariff line along our National boundary, Pennsylvania ought to be intersected by tariff lines, in all directions, with their attending collectors, searchers, and seizers.

There is, of course, in Pennsylvania what may be called a general level of wages, just as there is a general level of water in the ocean, even when its billows heave in storm—a line, theoretical it may be, toward which both depression and elevation tend to return; but this fact of itself proves the futility of the tariff in raising wages. Even in Pennsylvania the largest single industry is the agricultural, and the industries for which any pretense of protection by the tariff can be made, amount to only a small part of the total industries, since manifestly not only the agricultural industry, but all such industries as building, railroading, etc., cannot be protected by any tariff. The level of wages in any particular occupation, can, therefore, no matter how high the tariff, only be raised above the general level by conditions, natural or artificial, which in them check the competition for employment. And the same law must apply to the profits of capital, so that it is impossible for any amount of protection either to permanently increase wages, or to augment the profits of the manufacturer or operator, except as the element of monopoly enters in and fences off from home competition those whom the tariff may fence off from foreign competition. As a matter of fact, where no monopoly exists, wages and profits in the protected industries of Pennsylvania are not higher, but, I am inclined to think, rather lower than in the unprotected industries.

Protection has been for years a superstition in Pennsylvania, taught to the rising generation as an article of faith, and propagated by all the organs of public opinion and education. I think, however, its real and permanent strength lies in the fact, perceived by the working classes, that the competition of men whose only hope of gaining a livelihood is in getting the wages of some employer, does tend to cut down their earnings; and in the habit

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of thought that arises from this state of things, of regarding work as something that must be furnished or provided for the laborer, instead of something which has its natural origin in human wants. At the present time, at least, I think the working men of Pennsylvania realize pretty generally that the tariff which excludes the productions of foreign pauper labor gives free egress to the foreign pauper labor itself, and that they are anything but satisfied with their share of "protection." But, as railroads that may make half a dozen twentyfold millionaires, at the expense of the general public, will command the vote of the needy laborer whose only hope is to get the poor pay of a few days hard work, so, in spite of all its manifest absurdities and iniquities, does the idea of tariff protection commend itself to the masses of workingmen, because to them it seems to have at least the merit of "keeping work in the country"—or "preventing foreigners from doing our work."

For my part, I do not think it makes more than a temporary difference to the workingmen of Pennsylvania, or any other State, whether there is a protective tariff, a revenue tariff, or no tariff at all. A tariff only operates upon the movement of goods, not upon the movement of labor, and its effect is similar to that of a range of mountains, a sandy desert, or a pirate infested sea, in making more difficult the transportation of commodities. And with or without any of these things to affect the transportation of goods from other countries, the conditions of labor in Pennsylvania are such as must beget a tendency of wages towards the minimum which gives the mere laborer only a bare existence—a tendency which can only here and there be held somewhat in check by custom, labor combinations, boycotts, and strikes. The existence of the tramp, the pauper, the needy workman vainly seeking the opportunity to sell the only thing he has to sell, his power of labor, is proof of the existence and force of this tendency, against which the strongest labor combinations struggle like swimmers against a current. But the belief in protection, by drawing the attention of men away from the real cause of this tendency, and hounding them upon a false scent, diverts them from the only road by which the rights of labor can be secured.

If Pennsylvania could be cut off from all the rest of mankind by an impassable ditch or an unscalable wall—an isolation which the philosophy of Pennsylvania protectionists might lead them

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

devoutly to wish—the natural growth of population and the progress of material development must constantly tend to force the wages of the mere laborer towards the point of bare existence. For though labor is the appointed means by which all our material needs must be satisfied—the active factor in the production of all wealth—labor is of itself absolutely helpless. To make labor of any use it must have something to impress itself upon—must, in short, be able to avail itself of land. In any community, therefore, in which the land is the private property of some of the people, the other people, who have nothing but the ordinary power to labor, provided they get food, clothing, and shelter, become helpless, and must compete with each other for permission from the first class to live and to work. The influence of competition with each other among these mere laborers must tend to force them to give up to the owners of land all that their labor can produce upon it, save just enough to keep them in life.

The whole philosophy of the labor question may be seen as clearly upon a Pennsylvania coal estate as amid the primitive industrial conditions which obtain in Connemara or Skye. From zenith to nadir, that part of the globe embraced in one of these coal estates is the exclusive property of one man, or corporation. Other men can only live there on his sufferance, and can only go to work at his pleasure and on terms agreed to with him. Having an absolute power over the natural means of livelihood, he has thus a power over the laborers, which is only modified by their power of moving away and of making combinations among themselves by which he can be compelled to treat with them in the aggregate, and can be put to loss or inconvenience by their refusal to work.

In the complex industries of the great city which lies at the other extreme of the industrial scale, where much labor is devoted to exchanging, to the rendering of services, and to the working up of materials that have been taken from their original natural reservoirs, the relation between land and labor is not so obvious, especially as there are many other monopolies of various kinds that share with the monopoly of land the earnings which the helplessness of labor compels it to yield up. But the same relation still obtains. No matter where he exists, man is a land animal, who can only live on and from land, and all of whose production is but the changing in place or form of what he finds

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

already in existence on the superficies of the globe. The mere laborer, unless he has such special skill or ability as make a peculiar demand for his services, is as helpless in the one place as the other, and every avenue of employment is crowded with applicants who, disinherited of their natural right to employ themselves, must compete with each other for the wages of an employer.

The treatment of land as the private property of individuals —the attaching to the element from which all must live of the same exclusive rights of ownership which justly attach to the things which man produces—is so opposed to reason, so repugnant to all moral perceptions, that it has only come to be accepted through a long course of fraud and usurpation, in which habit has dulled the sense of natural right. Secure possession by the individual user, is, of course, necessary to the use of land, since it is requisite to secure the right of property in improvements. The manifest way to combine the individual right to improvements and products with the common right to the land itself, is that the holder of valuable land—*i. e.*, land which is worth a premium—should pay a fair rent to the community in return for the special privilege granted him. This, in a rude way, was accomplished by the feudal system, and the road by which private property in land was instituted among English-speaking people was, by the shaking off their rents on the part of the feudal tenants, and the resort to general taxation for the public revenues, originally obtained from land. Conversely, the best and easiest way to secure the equal rights of all in the land of their country, is to abolish all other taxation, and by a tax on land values to take for public use that value which attaches to land by reason of the growth of the community, and to make it unprofitable for any one to hold land he is not putting to use.

It is instructive to observe how, in Pennsylvania as in England, the interests of the wealthy classes who have been most influential in directing public opinion and making laws, have led to the taxing of everything rather than land values. The State of Pennsylvania not only attempts to tax mortgages, money at interest and notes, but also capital loaned or invested in any other State. Great tracts of mineral land are taxed at such nominal rates that they can be easily withheld from use, while the miner, taxed indirectly in all other ways, must also pay a tax upon his occupation, which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is rated according to the county at from $150 to $300, the millionaire coal owner being rated on his occupation at from $200 to $350.

How monopoly begets monopoly, and special privilege leads to general corruption, might nowhere be better illustrated than in ring-ridden Pennsylvania, with its railroad octopus, its coal combination, its Standard Oil Company, and its pig-iron "statesmen." And Pennsylvania may well feel hopeless of cutting away the monopolistic creepers which have enmeshed the Keystone State. "Take a pass!" said a Pennsylvanian to me, as I manifested some mild surprise at the statement that, although railroad passes are prohibited by the Constitution, Governor Pattison was the only man in the State who would not take a pass—"Take a pass! What is the use of fighting a corporation that rules the State. I would take a whole freight train, if they would give it to me." But though it may be useless to hack away at the branches, the tree of monopoly will fall if the ax be laid at its root. And private property in land, it will be found on examination, is the root of lesser monopolies.

HENRY GEORGE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BURNSIDE'S CONTROVERSIES WITH LINCOLN.

I.

EVERY step in the compilation of the War Records reveals material which throws new light on controverted points. I subjoin the correspondence between General Burnside and President Lincoln after the battle of Fredericksburgh, in which the General offered his resignation, and also recommended the removal of Secretary Stanton and General Halleck. The heated controversy which arose over this action will be remembered by every one conversant with the history of the Army of the Potomac. It did not, however, bring to light the important correspondence now presented, nor even establish its existence.

A brief recapitulation of the former discussion is necessary to a proper understanding of the new dispatches, and, at the same time, it will greatly increase their interest. Soon after the failure of General Burnside's attack on Fredericksburgh he visited Washington, and had a long conference with President Lincoln in regard to a second crossing of the Rappahannock, which he had planned and desired to execute. On the return of General Burnside to his army, he said, to several corps commanders, that, while in Washington, he had verbally tendered his resignation to President Lincoln, and had also recommended the removal of Secretary Stanton and General Halleck, on the ground that they had lost the confidence of the army, and the country; that he had subsequently reduced these recommendations to writing and read them to the President, in the presence of the Secretary of War and the General-in-Chief. This action of General Burnside first came before the public in definite shape after the report of the Committee on the Conduct of the War on the failure at Fredericksburgh. This report thus arraigned General W. B. Franklin:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The testimony of all the witnesses before your committee proves most conclusively that had the attack been made upon the left with all the force that General Franklin could have used for that purpose, the plan of General Burnside would have been completely successful, and our army would have achieved a most brilliant victory."

General Franklin, who in the meantime had been relieved from command, published, under date of York, Pa., April 25, 1863, a most conclusive answer to this charge, and incidentally repeated the statement of General Burnside, made upon his return from the conference with Mr. Lincoln, to which reference has been made above. On this point General Franklin wrote:

"—— and it is equally true, though not so publicly known, that * * * General Burnside made quite as formal and earnest a request to the President to remove the Secretary of War and the General-in-Chief from the positions severally occupied by them, as he did to dismiss certain of his officers in the Army of the Potomac."

This declaration led to a long correspondence between General Halleck and General Franklin. It was initiated by General Halleck, asking General Franklin on what authority he made the above statement. General Franklin, in 1866, added this correspondence to a second edition of his pamphlet. From this publication it appeared that, in the course of a long letter, he had thus presented the case to General Halleck:

"The facts are these: General Burnside was in Washington on or about January 1st last. He returned to camp, and soon after his return informed me, I think in the presence of General Smith, and perhaps others, that he had seen the President, and had verbally recommended to him the acceptance of his resignation, and the removal of the Secretary of War and yourself. The President, however, refused to entertain the suggestion, and the next interview that General Burnside had with him was in the presence of the Secretary of War and yourself. Between the first and second interviews he had reduced to writing the proposition which he had made in the first interview, and read to the President a letter to him, in which he tendered his own resignation, and proposed the vacation of the Secretary of War's and your positions, for the reason that all three of you had lost the confidence of the people. This is the substance of the story as I heard it from him just after his return to camp."

To this General Halleck replied at length, and upon the first point presented above he wrote:

"Immediately on receiving your pamphlet I addressed a note to General Burnside, calling his attention to what you had stated in regard to his having *formally* and *earnestly* requested my removal, and, as he has not denied its correctness, I presume he admits it.

"There is one singular statement in your letter, in regard to the embodying of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

General Burnside's recommendation for our removal in his letter of resignation, and reading it to the President in the presence of the Secretary and myself. There is not a word of truth in this, so far as I am concerned. The only letter of resignation of General Burnside which I ever saw or heard of made no allusion to either of us."

At a later date General Halleck repeated the above statement, and added :

"What General Burnside may have said to the President or Secretary of War about me, in my absence, I, of course, do not know ; but I have assurances that he never suggested my removal to either."

Later still, in 1866, when General Franklin notified General Halleck of his intention to publish the correspondence between them, the latter wrote :

"Both Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Stanton assured me at the time that General Burnside never made to them, or in their presence, the statement alluded to in your pamphlet, but that, on the contrary, he had always expressed full confidence in, and warm regard for, both the Secretary and myself."

Such are the points of the former correspondence that are necessary to the full understanding of that to follow.

The compilation of the War Records has disclosed what, according to General Burnside, did take place at his conference with President Lincoln. These new letters also show that General Halleck asked to be relieved from his position as General-in-Chief, and set forth, in an interesting form, General Burnside's decided purpose to cross the Rappahannock for a second attack, and the unanimous opposition of his corps commanders to the movement.

I.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
WASHINGTON, *January* 1, 1863.

MAJOR-GENERAL HALLECK :

MY DEAR SIR : General Burnside wishes to cross the Rappahannock with his army, but his grand division commanders all oppose the movement. If, in such a difficulty as this, you do not help, you fail me precisely in the point for which I sought your assistance. You know what General Burnside's plan is, and it is my wish that you go with him to the ground, examine it as far as practicable, confer with the officers, getting their judgment and ascertaining their temper ; in a word, gather all the elements for forming a judgment of your own, and then tell General Burnside that you do approve or that you do not approve his plan. Your military skill is useless to me if you will not do this.

Yours, very truly, A. LINCOLN.

January 1, 1863.

Withdrawn, because considered harsh by General Halleck.

A. LINCOLN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II.

HEADQUARTERS OF THE ARMY,
WASHINGTON, *January* 1, 1863.

HON. E. M. STANTON, Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.:

SIR: From my recent interview with the President and yourself, and from the President's letter of this morning, which you delivered to me at your reception, I am led to believe that there is a very important difference of opinion in regard to my relations toward generals commanding armies in the field, and that I cannot perform the duties of my present office satisfactorily at the same time to the President and to myself. I therefore respectfully request that I may be relieved from further duties as General-in-Chief.*

Very respectfully your obedient servant, H. W. HALLECK.

III.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January* 1, 1863.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

Since leaving you this morning I have determined that it is my duty to place on paper the remarks which I made to you, in order that you may use them or not, as you see proper.

I am in command, as you know, of nearly 200,000 men, 120,000 of whom are in the immediate presence of the enemy, and I cannot conscientiously retain the command without making an unreserved statement of my views.

The Secretary of War has not the confidence of the officers and soldiers, and I feel sure that he has not the confidence of the country. In regard to the latter statement, you are probably better informed than I am. The same opinion applies with equal force in regard to General Halleck. It seems to be the universal opinion that the movements of the army have not been planned with a view to co-operation and mutual assistance.

I have attempted a movement upon the enemy in which I have been repulsed, and I am convinced, after mature deliberation, that the army ought to make another movement in the same direction, not necessarily at the same points on the river; but I am not sustained in this by a single grand division commander in my command. My reasons for having issued the order for making this second movement I have already given you in full, and I can see no reason for changing my views. Doubtless this difference of opinion between my general officers and myself results from a lack of confidence in me. In this case it is highly necessary that this army should be commanded by some other officer, to whom I will most cheerfully give way.

Will you allow me, Mr. President, to say that it is of the utmost importance that you be surrounded and supported by men who have the confidence of the people and of the army, and who will at all times give you definite and honest opinions in relation to their separate departments, and at the same time give you positive and unswerving support in your public policy, taking at all times their full share of the responsibility for that policy? In no positions held by gentlemen near you are these conditions more requisite than those of the Secretary of War and General-in-Chief and the commanders of your armies. In the struggle now going on, in which the very existence of our Government is at stake, the in-

* NOTE.—As duplicates are found among General Halleck's papers, and no copy is found in the War Department's files, it is presumed that this application was withdrawn upon withdrawal of the President's letter.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terests of no one man are worth the value of a grain of sand, and no one should be allowed to stand in the way of accomplishing the greatest amount of public good.

It is my belief that I ought to retire to private life. I hope you will not understand this to savor of anything like dictation. My only desire is to promote the public good. No man is an accurate judge of the confidence in which he is held by the public, and the people around him, and the confidence in my management may be entirely destroyed, in which case it would be a great wrong for me to retain this command for a single day ; and, as I before said, I will most cheerfully give place to any other officer. *

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

A. E. BURNSIDE,
Major-General Commanding Army of Potomac.

IV.

HEADQUARTERS ARMY OF THE POTOMAC,
January 5, 1863.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES :

Since my return to the army I have become more than ever convinced that the general officers of this command are almost unanimously opposed to another crossing of the river, but I am still of the opinion that the crossing should be attempted, and I have accordingly issued orders to the engineers and artillery to prepare for it. There is much hazard in it, as there always is in the majority of military movements, and I cannot begin the movement without giving you notice of it, particularly as I know so little of the effect that it may have upon other movements of distant armies.

The influence of your telegram the other day is still upon me, and has impressed me with the idea that there are many parts of the problem which influence you that are not known to me.

In order to relieve you from all embarrassment in my case, I inclose with this my resignation of my commission as Major-General of Volunteers, which you can have accepted, if my movement is not in accordance with the views of yourself and your military advisers.

I have taken the liberty to write to you personally upon this subject, because it was necessary, as I learn from General Halleck, for you to approve of my general plan, written at Warrenton, before I should commence the movement, and I think it quite as necessary that you should know of the important movement I am about to make, particularly as it will have to be made in opposition to the views of nearly all my general officers, and after the receipt of a dispatch from you, informing me of the opinion of some of them who had visited you.

[In conversation with you on New Year's morning, I was led to express some opinions which I afterward felt it my duty to place on paper, and to express them verbally to the gentlemen of whom we were speaking, which I did in your presence after handing you the letter. You were not disposed then, as I saw, to retain the letter, and I took it back, but I now return it to you for record, if you wish it.]†

I beg leave to say that my resignation is not sent in any spirit of insubordi-

* NOTE.—This letter is from General Burnside's copy; it does not appear among Mr. Lincoln's papers.

† NOTE.—The paragraph in brackets is in General Burnside's copy of this letter, but is not in that received by the President. Mr. Lincoln noted upon his copy that the letter had been answered by his indorsement upon General Halleck's letter of January 7.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nation; but, as I before said, simply to relieve you from any embarrassment in changing commanders, where lack of confidence may have rendered it necessary.

The bearer of this will bring me any answer, or I should be glad to hear from you by telegraph in cipher.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

A. E. BURNSIDE,
Major-General Commanding Army of the Potomac.

V.

HEADQUARTERS ARMY OF THE POTOMAC,
January 5, 1863.

MAJ.-GEN. H. W. HALLECK, General-in-Chief, Washington, D. C.:

GENERAL: I have decided to move the army across the river again, and have accordingly given the directions to the engineers and artillery to make the necessary preparations to effect the crossing.

Since I last saw you it has become more apparent that the movement must be made almost entirely upon my own responsibility, so far as this army is concerned, and I do not ask you to assume any responsibility in reference to the mode or place of crossing; but it seems to me that, in making so hazardous a movement, I should receive some general directions from you as to the advisability of crossing at some point, as you are necessarily well informed of the effect at this time upon other parts of the army of a success or a repulse. You will readily see that the responsibility of crossing without the knowledge of this effect, and against the opinion of nearly all the general officers, involves a greater responsibility than any officer, situated as I am, ought to incur.

In view of the President's telegram to me the other day, and with its influence still upon me, I have written to him on this subject, and inclosed to him my resignation, directed to the Adjutant-General, to be accepted in case it is not deemed advisable for me to cross the river.

I send this resignation because I have no other plan of campaign for this winter, and I am not disposed to go into winter quarters.

It may be well to add that recent information goes to show that the enemy's force has not been diminished in our front to any great extent.

The bearer of this will bring me any answer, or I shall be glad to hear from you in cipher.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

A. E. BURNSIDE,
Major-General Commanding Army of the Potomac.

VI.

HEADQUARTERS OF THE ARMY,
WASHINGTON, *January* 7, 1863.

MAJOR-GENERAL BURNSIDE, Commanding, etc., Falmouth:

GENERAL: Your communication of the 5th was delivered to me by your aide-de-camp at 12 M. to-day.

In all my communications and interviews with you since you took command of the Army of the Potomac, I have advised a forward movement across the Rappahannock. At our interview at Warrenton, I urged that you should cross by the fords above Fredericksburgh, rather than to fall down to that place, and, when I left you at Warrenton, it was understood that at least a considerable part of your army would cross by the fords, and I so represented to the President. It was this modification of the plan proposed by you, that I telegraphed you had received his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

approval. When the attempt at Fredericksburgh was abandoned, I advised you to renew the attempt at some other point, either in whole or in part, to turn the enemy's works, or to threaten their wings or communications; in other words, to keep the enemy occupied till a favorable opportunity offered to strike a decisive blow. I particularly advised you to use your cavalry and light artillery upon his communications, and attempt to cut off his supplies and engage him at an advantage.

In all our interviews I have urged that our first object was, not Richmond, but the defeat or scattering of Lee's army, which threatened Washington and the line of the Upper Potomac. I now recur to these things simply to remind you of the general views which I have expressed, and which I still hold.

The circumstances of the case, however, have somewhat changed since the early part of November. The chances of an extended line of operations are now, on account of the advanced season, much less than then. But the chances are still in our favor to meet and defeat the enemy on the Rappahannock, if we can effect a crossing in a position where we can meet the enemy on favorable, or even equal, terms. I therefore still advise a movement against him. The character of that movement, however, must depend upon circumstances, which may change any day and almost any hour. If the enemy should concentrate his forces at the place you have selected for a crossing, make it a feint and try another place. Again, the circumstances at the time may be such as to render an attempt to cross the entire army not advisable. In that case theory suggests that, while the enemy concentrates at that point, advantages can be gained by crossing smaller forces at other points, to cut off his lines, destroy his communication, and capture his rear guards, outposts, etc. The great object is to occupy the enemy, to prevent his making large detachments or distant raids, and to injure him all you can with the least injury to yourself. If this can be best accomplished by feints of a general crossing and detached real crossings, take that course; if by an actual general crossing, with feints on other points, adopt that course. There seems to me to be many reasons why a crossing at some point should be attempted. It will not do to keep your large army inactive. As you yourself admit, it devolves on you to decide upon the time, place, and character of the crossing which you may attempt. I can only advise that an attempt be made, and as early as possible.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

H. M. HALLECK, General-in-Chief.

VII.

January 8, 1863.

GENERAL BURNSIDE:

I understand General Halleck has sent you a letter, of which this is a copy. I approve this letter. I deplore the want of concurrence with you in opinion by your general officers, but I do not see the remedy. Be cautious, and do not understand that the Government or country is driving you. I do not yet see how I could profit by changing the command of the Army of the Potomac, and if I did, I should not wish to do it by accepting the resignation of your commission.

A. LINCOLN.

VIII.

The work of compilation has established the authenticity of a famous order which properly forms the sequel of the history presented in the preceding letters and dispatches. This was known

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the discussions of the time as "Order No. 8." It was prepared by General Burnside, and decreed the dismissal of Generals Hooker, Newton, Brooks, and Cochrane, and the relief from duty of Generals Franklin, W. F. Smith, Sturgis, and others. It was not approved by Mr. Lincoln, and an order of the same number, on another subject, took its place in the official series. It was printed as a newspaper special, but its authenticity was first questioned, and then denied. Subsequently, General Burnside mentioned its general character and history, before the Committee on the Conduct of the War, but its terms were not given. After General Burnside's death it was given in Poore's Life of that officer, but necessarily without the full text of the orders and dispatches, which now serve to fully explain it. The original has now been discovered, and has its proper place in the War Records.

Briefly stated, its history is this: Soon after Mr. Lincoln had declined to accept the resignation of General Burnside, the latter ordered a second crossing of the river. But that furious storm set in which gave the name of "Mud March" to the movement, and the army returned to its camps. There was much severe and open criticism of the move by a number of high officers. Thereupon General Burnside caused Order No. 8 to be drawn up, and also wrote his resignation. He took both to Washington, and said to the President that he must approve the order, or accept the resignation. Mr. Lincoln declined to give his approval, and General Burnside was induced to take a leave of absence, instead of resigning. The President then assigned General Hooker, whom General Burnside had asked to have dismissed, to the command of the army. The following letters and orders tell the official story:

IX.

HEADQUARTERS ARMY OF THE POTOMAC,
January 23, 1863—8:50 P. M.

HIS EXCELLENCY ABRAHAM LINCOLN, President of the United States:

I have prepared some very important orders, and I want to see you before issuing them. Can I see you alone if I am at the White House after midnight? I must be back by 8 o'clock to-morrow morning.

A. E. BURNSIDE, Major-General Commanding.

X.

HEADQUARTERS ARMY OF THE POTOMAC,
January 23, 1863.

GENERAL ORDERS, No. 8.

I. General Joseph Hooker, Major-General of Volunteers and Brigadier-General U. S. Army, having been guilty of unjust and unnecessary criticisms of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

actions of his superior officers and of the authorities, and having, by the general tone of his conversation, endeavored to create distrust in the minds of officers who have associated with him, and having, by omissions and otherwise, made reports and statements which were calculated to create incorrect impressions, and for habitually speaking in disparaging terms of other officers, is hereby dismissed the service of the United States as a man unfit to hold an important commission during a crisis like the present, when so much patience, charity, confidence, consideration, and patriotism are due from every soldier in the field. This order is issued subject to the approval of the President of the United States.

II. Brig.-Gen. W. T. H. Brooks, commanding First Division, Sixth Army Corps, for complaining of the policy of the Government, and for using language tending to demoralize his command, is, subject to the approval of the President, dismissed from the military service of the United States.

III. Brig.-Gen. John Newton, commanding Third Division, Sixth Army Corps, and Brig-Gen. John Cochrane, commanding First Brigade, Third Division, Sixth Army Corps, for going to the President of the United States with criticisms upon the plans of their commanding officer, are, subject to the approval of the President, dismissed from the military service of the United States.

IV. It being evident that the following named officers can be of no further service to this army, they are hereby relieved from duty, and will report in person without delay to the Adjutant-General U. S. Army: Maj.-Gen. W. B. Franklin, Commanding Left Grand Division; Maj.-Gen. W. F. Smith, Commanding Sixth Corps; Brig.-Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis, Commanding Second Division, Ninth Corps; Brig.-Gen. Edward Ferrero, Commanding Second Brigade, Second Division, Ninth Army Corps; Brig.-Gen. John Cochrane, Commanding First Brigade, Third Division, Sixth Corps; Lieut.-Col. J. H. Taylor, Assistant Adjutant-General, Right Grand Division.

By Command of Maj.-Gen. A. E. Burnside.

LEWIS RICHMOND, Assistant Adjutant-General.

XI.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
WASHINGTON, *January* 25, 1863.

MAJOR-GENERAL HALLECK:

MY DEAR SIR: Please meet General Burnside here at 10 o'clock this morning.

Yours truly, A. LINCOLN.

XII.

WAR DEPARTMENT, ADJT.-GEN.'S OFFICE,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *January* 25, 1863.

GENERAL ORDERS, No. 20:

I. The President of the United States has directed:

1st. That Major-Gen. A. E. Burnside, at his own request, be relieved from the command of the Army of the Potomac.

2d. That Major-Gen. E. V. Sumner, at his own request, be relieved from duty in the Army of the Potomac.

3d. That Major-Gen. W. B. Franklin be relieved from duty in the Army of the Potomac.

4th. That Major-Gen. J. Hooker be assigned to the command of the Army of the Potomac.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II. The officers relieved as above, will report in person to the Adjutant-General of the Army.

By order of the Secretary of War.

E. D. TOWNSEND, Assistant Adjutant-General.

Though the above orders are not new, such fresh and forcible meaning is imparted to them by the records which precede, as to fully justify their reproduction. The same remarks are applicable to Mr. Lincoln's letter to General Hooker, which properly closes this notable chapter in the history of the Army of the Potomac, and which is as remarkable as the circumstances under which it was written.

XIII.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January* 25, 1863.

MAJOR-GEN. J. HOOKER, commanding, etc.:

GENERAL: The President directs me to say that he wishes an interview with you at the Executive Mansion as early as possible.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

H. W. HALLECK, General-in-Chief.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *January* 26, 1863.

MAJOR-GENERAL HOOKER:

GENERAL: I have placed you at the head of the Army of the Potomac. Of course I have done this upon what appears to me to be sufficient reasons, and yet I think it best for you to know that there are some things in regard to which I am not quite satisfied with you. I believe you to be a brave and skillful soldier, which, of course, I like. I also believe you do not mix politics with your profession, in which you are right. You have confidence in yourself, which is a valuable, if not an indispensable, quality. You are ambitious, which, within reasonable bounds, does good rather than harm, but I think that during General Burnside's command of the army you have taken counsel of your ambition and thwarted him as much as you could, in which you did a great wrong to the country, and to a most meritorious and honorable brother officer. I have heard, in such way as to believe it, of your recently saying that both the army and the Government needed a dictator. Of course it was not for this, but in spite of it, that I have given you the command. Only those generals who gain successes can set up dictators. What I now ask of you is military success, and I will risk the dictatorship. The Government will support you to the utmost of its ability, which is neither more nor less than it has done, and will do, for all commanders. I much fear that the spirit which you have aided to infuse into the army, of criticising their commander and withholding confidence from him, will now turn upon you. I shall assist you as far as I can to put it down. Neither you nor Napoleon, if he were alive again, could get any good out of an army while such a spirit prevails in it. And now, beware of rashness. Beware of rashness, but with energy and sleepless vigilance go forward and give us victories.

Yours very truly,

A. LINCOLN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

RELIGION.

CERTAIN theologians and lexicographers declare that religion is merely a term for the designation of worship, according to established systems. Good use of the word, I am ready enough to grant; but, were that its only application, I could scarcely hope, using it as a caption, to say anything which has not already been said by those who know more than I do of theology. It seems to me that a certain extension of the scope of the word should be as generally accepted as the color which the theologians give it. Religion, first of all, should mean the principles which govern human lives. Worship, whether public or private, should be regarded as a matter of secondary importance.

A man's religion is a man's code of moral ethics. If he has no moral ethics, he may worship forever, according to established systems; he will still be minus religion, in its true sense. The man who participates in public worship, for the mere sake of seeming religious, is viler and lower than the meanest of animate creations. His whole life is one of harmfulness, deception, and treachery. Those who penetrate his mask and see the contemptible rottenness which it covers, relegate others who are worthy and honest into the same category with this hypocrite. A thousand are falsely accused and censured for his sake. Others, failing to read so clearly, do not detect the sores of this leper, and so from them he receives praise and credit for his seeming piety. Worse than all, he insults his God. Another man, who makes neither show nor pretense, allows himself to do nothing which he would not be willing to accept as just and right if vouchsafed to him from others. He gives, always, value for value, and sees to it that no man suffers at his hands. In public worship he is never seen, and of piety he never speaks with faltering voice and downcast eyes.

No one would, for a single second, be at a loss which of these to choose from the standpoint of manliness; yet, if religion be only a system of worship, the knave would be counted worthy of an eternal crown of glory by theologians, while the other, the man with the conscience, would be relegated to perpetual gloom and darkness. Religion a system! A system for worshiping God! Why not, as well, require all human hearts to beat in concert, and pounce down, with scorn and stern rebuke, upon whoever dares breathe either a little in advance of, or a trifle behind, his brother. Ridiculous, perhaps, but certainly consistent. The fact is, the world is overrun and worn out with systems. They are the enemies of originality, the destroyers of freedom, the slayers of common sense. Life is made baneful, happiness is marred, love itself is scourged and flayed for the convenience and fostering of systems.

Religion is not a matter of outward, but of inward, importance. It is of small consequence, what the world may say or think, so long as one's soul bears neither

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stain nor goadmark. Roguery, not honesty, requires a system. Nobility of soul is as simple as sunshine ; it is in trickery and knavery where complications are. To have the name of one's Creator constantly on one's lips, and to make no further demonstration that one ever thinks of him, may be all that the system of worship requires ; but there is room for doubt as to whether this is the sort of religion which a dying man will turn to, in his last moments, for consolation and comfort.

Perhaps my judgment is perverted, and, perhaps I am stubborn ; but I doubt if the man whose religion consists entirely of public worship, and the constant whining of the name of the deity, ever feels any actual reverence for the sacred name he says so often.

I do not wish to be understood as in any sense crying down public worship. None, I am sure, respect it more than I do. In the present condition of human affairs, it is a most valuable and necessary institution. Notwithstanding the revolting crimes and sins which it seems to approve, cloak, and sanction, we should be infinitely worse off without it. We must keep it and sustain it until we have something to substitute for it, which, generally speaking, will be better than it. As for me, I am of the opinion that the day will come when the ecstasies of religion, like the ecstasies of love, will be surrendered to in secret—without the profaning gaze or presence of scoffers and hypocrites. All prayer will then be straight from the heart to its Creator ; and His name will be held in such reverence and awe that devotees will only whisper it in their souls. Its common mention and use will then be punishable as a crime, and sacred things will no longer be made a matter of form, system, and lightness.

Moral and spiritual health may then be possible ; laws will, possibly, be something more than empty words, embracing and clothing unheeded formulas ; and the penalties of transgression may be taken into account. The saying of prescribed rites being discontinued, there will be less opportunities for hypocrisy. Fewer persons will profess being followers of that which the divine law demands and compels, but more will possess actual religion. Seeming, rather than being, according to the present state of things, will be reversed into being, rather than seeming : and so the good old Roman aphorism will once more become something else than a mere pretty thing to quote.

If I am blind, and all wrong—if system and form, and parade and show, are, after all, really wisest and best, I have the consolation of knowing that no one whose views are antagonistic to mine will be apostatized by what I have said. And there is, also, the still pleasanter thought that I may have helped and encouraged some one who shares with me the feelings which I have tried to express.

GEORGE SAND.

II.

HENRY GEORGE'S LAND TAX.

THE theory of Henry George, that land should be taxed for all public expenses, and that all other property should be relieved from taxation, has recently come into such prominence that it certainly demands serious attention. Mr. George is acknowledged, on all hands, to be perfectly sincere in his teachings. It is everywhere admitted that he is a man of remarkable intelligence and ability. His bitterest opponents credit him with the best of intentions. Is it not reasonable, therefore, to suppose that his economic doctrine of land taxation, whether right or wrong, is closely allied to some great truth ? How else could he have impressed it upon thousands of minds, thoughout Europe and America ?

Again, if Mr. George is in error, he must be understood before he can be cor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rected. Neither he nor his followers are men to be cured by throwing adjectives at them in the dark. The wise thing to do, then, is to find out exactly why Mr. George entertains his special economic theory of land taxation, and exactly whence he derived it. By following him closely, we may observe some matters that he has not seen, and new facts may lead to new conclusions.

Mr. George said recently that it was not necessary to hunt in obscure places for the basis of his doctrine, as it was contained in the first chapter of the Bible: "In the beginning God made the heavens and the earth." Mr. George meant, of course, that, as God made the heavens and the earth for all mankind, a few men have no right to monopolize the common gift. When the science of political economy was born, Aristotle, the father of it, defined what is called "natural wealth" —the earth, the air, the water—as "the bounty of nature." This bounty of nature, not being produced by man, but being a general gift equally essential to the very existence of all human beings, the profoundest political economists of the world—among them Mill, Spencer and George—pronounce it common property. Did my lord Blackstone do the same thing, when he said: "I see no reason, in nature or in natural law, why a deed upon parchment should convey the dominion of land?"

Now, Henry George, in his "Progress and Poverty," defines "land" as precisely synonymous with Aristotle's "bounty of nature." "Land," says Mr. George, is "the whole material universe outside of man himself." The term "embraces all natural materials, forces, and opportunities."

It appears to me that Henry George makes no improvement on Aristotle, in calling the whole bounty of nature "land." But one thing is certain, and Mr. George cannot escape from it. If "land" includes all natural wealth—all the bounty of nature—and if land is to be specially taxed as common property, then a tax on merely the *ground* is not a *land tax* at all. To be a land tax it would have to be placed on all "natural wealth"—the whole "bounty of nature."

The truth is that "land," according to Mr. George's broad, economic definition, and according to the fact itself, is the universal base and raw material of everything that human beings touch, improve, work up, or in any way produce. Every stone and timber in a house is just as evidently a piece of natural wealth, a segment of the common bounty of nature, as the ground whence it came; only the raw wood or stone has been modified by labor. But Henry George would not tax the natural wealth in the timber or the stone. He would not tax a house, but the plot under it. He would not tax a lump of gold, but the hole out of which it was dug. Thus, to state Mr. George's own position in regard to land is to overturn his land tax.

But he arrives at his conclusion by two ways. We have followed him through one of them. Let us now take the other.

What gives increasing value to land? he asks. His answer is that population does it—all society. In a new country, where land is had for the asking, it has no value. Let some Daniel Boone isolate himself from the world, who will give him a cent for the ground on which he settles? While he is *alone* it has no value, though it may have utility, in so far as it supplies his individual wants. But when society comes about him his farm turns into a fortune. It was not Daniel Boone, says Mr. George, who put the value into that property: the whole community did it. And why should they not tax out the unearned increment?

Well, the trouble here, too, is that Mr. George sees only one-half of a great economic fact. It is not merely land—the ground—that increases in value through the general presence of society, but everything else is subject to precisely the same law. Every piece of land has been made more and more valuable by the presence of population. But so has every house that has been built on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the land. As population gathers about the house, and other houses are built up, every brick in the first one—yes, and every stroke of labor that went to make the brick, or put it in position—is raised in value. In other words, there is no such thing as value without society—two persons, at least—one who has something that the other wants. In this respect, therefore, a house, and even the labor that builds a house, is precisely like the land under it. Lands, houses, and the labor put upon them, all depend for their value on population, society, the commonwealth. Thus a house would be common property, by the same right as a piece of land, and the fruits of individual labor would be common property as rightfully as either the land or the house. The bounty of nature is a part of every one of them, and all increments of value depend on supply in proportion to population. In short, the natural and moral tenure to land differs in no way from the natural and moral tenure to any other kind of property.

In 1882, the wealth of the United States was estimated thus:

Land	$10,750,000,000
Houses	13,900,000,000
Railways	5,450,000,000
Cattle	1,890,000,000
Sundries	9,205,000,000
Total	$41,195,000,000

According to this table, our land value, in this country, is not much more than one-quarter of all values. Yet Mr. George would make this one-quarter of wealth bear all the public burdens of the other three-quarters, in addition to its own. Could a more unjust tax, or a much worse monopoly, be imagined?

And now let us find, if we can, what has caused such a startling gap between Mr. George's premises and his conclusions. I believe the explanation is easy.

With the world's greatest political economists, and more vividly than all the rest of them, Henry George sees that natural wealth, or rather what Jefferson called the "usufruct" of it, always belongs to mankind as a birthright—to society as a whole. At the same time, he is no socialist, no communist. He sees that individuals are rigidly entitled to the fruits of their labor, their economy, their industry, their capacity. Through his land tax, he honestly and earnestly tries to separate the people's natural share in wealth from the shares of individuals, according to their work. But when land (the bounty of nature) has been taken out of land (the ground) for thousands of years, and transformed into the varied wealth of all civilization, a land tax, in the sense of a mere ground tax, touches only about one-quarter of the wealth it ought to reach. Yet Mr. George's "Progress and Poverty" is so superb a work, so persuasively constructed, and so full of great, needed truth, that he has almost overwhelmed the very elect with one of the most glaring and disjointed non-sequiturs that ever broke itself in two with its own logic.

But is there no way, then, to separate the value of natural wealth—the people's heritage—from the value of improvements made on it by individuals?—giving the whole people their due, and rendering also to every individual the exact compensation for his work, his enterprise, his ability and economy? I think there is a clear way to that end, and that the end can be reached by the collection and public use of a proper tax. In fact, I see very clearly that scientific taxation will yet be, not only the cure of economic wrongs and distresses, but the antidote, also, for socialism, communism, and the many economic poisons that are now held up as remedies. In the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW of July last, I attempted to propound and explain such a tax. Something of the kind will come in due time. But let the public never forget that, if Henry George has made one great logical and prac-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tical mistake, he has inaugurated the correct tendency of a whole epoch. He has earned all his laurels, and more.

EDWARD GORDON CLARK.

III.

ARE THE HEATHEN OUR INFERIORS?

IT is no trouble for Gail Hamilton to make any subject interesting. Whatever she touches emits electric sparks. But even her charming pen rarely flames with such a volume of electric *light* as she pours into her contribution to the December REVIEW, entitled "Heathendom and Christendom Under Test." What a neat rebuke it is to that monstrosity—that "Frankenstein" of our English and American self-conceit—that we are the only people fit to be glorified, and all other peoples are only fit to be damnified.

When young and innocent, I spent a good many years in the study of theology, not with the retainer of any sect in my pocket, and the implied promise never to move out of a given rut, but from the impulsion of intense necessity to know the truth. One conclusion that I came to, as the result of those years, was that there is no shadow of authority in the teachings of Jesus for the vulgar impression that any special division of humanity is God's cohort, or that any other special division has been expropriated of His love and light. Jesus was too busy establishing the general "fatherhood of God," and "brotherhood of man," and in dissecting the Scribes and Pharisees immediately around him, to think of the "Good Samaritan" as a "heathen." The "Son of Man" looked upon all other men as His brothers. Feeling full of God's truth, and believing that He truly represented the Father, Jesus did insist that all men and women must approach God in the spirit of love and self abnegation, of which He felt himself to be the incarnation and example. But that is all an erect, healthy mind can find in His actual inculcations. The rest has come from the cross-eyed, hump-backed, club-footed souls that have looked out at Jesus through their own deformities. The pious *mirage* that God looks upon one nation of His creatures to bless them, and another to curse them, has risen out of the egotism—the hard, narrow egotism alone—of theological crusaders who mistake themselves for the Good Shepherd's meek and gentle lambs. It has just the same foundation as the puerile exclusiveness which used to prompt the North-End boys of Calvinistic Boston, in the old times, to sling stones at the South-Enders, and which still arrays the children of one block in Brooklyn, "the City of Churches," against the children of the next block.

But I wish that Gail Hamilton would go a little farther with her brilliant and caustic analysis. "Mrs. S. L. Baldwin, a missionary of the Methodist Board in China," petitions our United States Congress to let her import a Chinese servant, because Christian servants are so much inferior to the heathen. Gail Hamilton naturally feels that the heathen servants ought not to be damned hereafter, for being better than the Christian servants here. But, looking at matters in her practical way, are the Christian nations of the world, to-day, superior to the heathen nations anyhow, except in force of intellect, enterprise, and *wickedness*? "Chinatown," in San Francisco, is commonly depicted as concentrating all the depravity of Joss-house civilization. But is not every vice of Chinatown duplicated, two to one, in New York? In point of actual, not hypocritical morality, for instance, in the ordinary sense, is London better than Constantinople, and is Washington any better than Salt Lake City? Gail Hamilton's analysis and criticism are capable of extension.

JOSEPH HEWES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IV.

ARTHUR RICHMOND AND THE PRESIDENT.

WHILE recognizing the propriety of the REVIEW giving space to personal criticisms upon public characters, I must say that when such essays degenerate into mere vituperative assaults, without justifiable cause, on distinguished public functionaries, I am not only surprised, but somewhat disgusted. Of this sort is the latest letter of Arthur Richmond, where President Cleveland is attacked. It reads as if some one had been employed for this especial service, and found difficulty in getting, I will not say just ground, but recognized ground of attack.

There is no justification. Arthur Richmond has discovered what the press of the United States has failed to find. And he must remember that the press is Republican. Time was in the now half-forgotten past when the press lived exclusively upon circulation, and the noble editor tried, then, to please by putting on record the opinions of his subscribers. That day no longer exists. Advertising is the life blood of the press, and the editor edits to please his patrons. They are the business men of the country, and the business men are republicans. Therefore is it that if President Cleveland were open to the strictures indulged in by Arthur Richmond the abuse would find echo throughout the land. This is not the fact, and, therefore, the invectives of this home-made Junius fall harmless.

Now, while President Cleveland is not a great man, makes no pretensions to statesmanship, he has won the liking of the masses and conquered the respect of his political enemies by a sturdy, almost obstinate, adhesion to what he holds to be good. He has in healthy operation a brain power that gives the best results of what is known as strong common sense, and his motive power is a conscientious desire to do his duty. He comes nearer to what is known under that thread-bare phrase of a man of the people, than any prominent figure since the days of Andrew Jackson. That he will not enact so brilliant a rôle as did Old Hickory we can well know, because Cleveland has no such party at his back. Our President, indeed, may be said, in this respect, to stand alone. The Democracy did not even elect him, and although half the people of the United States respond to-day to this designation, it is not a party in the sense of that name when President Jackson vetoed the bill perpetuating the United States bank, ruined the depositors and drove nullification into silence by threatening to hang Calhoun. The solid South is solid, not because of its Democracy, but because of its negroes. This mass of brutal ignorance was suddenly lifted into citizenship and made the governing element by republican carpet-baggers and bayonets. It was forced into a deadly antagonism by a sense of self-protection. And so it stands to-day, actually in favor of a personal government that would give heavy appropriations under the flag, with about as much Democracy in it as that possessed by the Czar of Russia.

The Ohio Democracy is clamorous for a protection to wool, and Pennsylvania Randallism wants the earth in that direction. The political condition of affairs is enough to make the old leaders in the time of Jackson turn in their graves.

President Cleveland then, so far as a party is concerned, stands alone. He cannot even conciliate the leaders of the so-called Democracy, and gratify his followers by giving them freely what they won in the late Presidential election; and that is the offices. Through a lot of comical statesmanship indulged in by the Hon. George Pendleton, and cunningly carried out by the republicans, the democrats are denied the offices. No man can be turned out except for cause, and no man can be appointed until after a so-called competitive examination that will show, whether the applicant is honest or not, he must be educated. This is hard on our Democracy.

To hold President Cleveland responsible, as Arthur Richmond seeks to do, for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the passage or failure to pass certain measures is simply absurd. The Senate is in the hands of the republicans. The House itself, with the Randall element in it, is not assured to the Democracy, and, so far as reform is concerned, the President is as helpless as if he were yet Sheriff at Buffalo. So all Arthur Richmond's labored crimination and pretended indignation simply makes one tired. An honest, unpretending, able man is President Cleveland. He is giving us a clean administration, and all such attacks are either insincere or silly.

DONN PIATT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED